arXiv:1403.0846v3 [math.RT] 21 Nov 2014

QUIVERS WITH LOOPS AND GENERALIZED CRYSTALS

TRISTAN BOZEC

ABSTRACT. In the context of varieties of representations of arbitrary quivers, possibly carrying loops, we define a generalization of Lusztig Lagrangian subvarieties. From the combinatorial study of their irreducible components arises a structure richer than the usual Kashiwara crystals. Along with the geometric study of Nakajima quiver varieties, in the same context, this yields a notion of generalized crystals, coming with a tensor product. As an application, we define the semicanonical basis of the Hopf algebra generalizing quantum groups, which was already equipped with a canonical basis. The irreducible components of the Nakajima varieties provide the family of highest weight crystals associated to dominant weights, as in the classical case.

CONTENTS

Introduction 1
1. Lusztig quiver varieties 2
1.1. The case of the Jordan quiver 4
1.2. The case of the quiver with one vertex and $g \geq 2$ loops 4
1.3. The general case 8
1.4. Constructible functions 10
2. Nakajima quiver varieties 12
2.1. A crystal-type structure 12
2.2. Extension to the stable locus 14
2.3. Tensor product on $\mathrm{Irr}\,\mathfrak{L}$ 16
2.4. Another Lagrangian subvariety 17
2.5. Comparison of two crystal-type structures 19
3. Generalized crystals 22
3.1. A generalized quantum group 22
3.2. Kashiwara operators 24
3.3. Definition of generalized crystals 27
3.4. The crystal $\mathcal{B}(\infty)$ 29
3.5. The crystals $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ 32
3.6. Grand loop argument 38
References 44

INTRODUCTION

Lusztig defined in [Lus91] Lagrangian subvarieties of the cotangent stack to the moduli stack of representations of a quiver associated to any Kac-Moody algebra. The proof of the Lagrangian character of these varieties was obtained via the study of some natural stratifications of each irreducible component, and then proceeding

by induction. The particular combinatorial structure thus attached to the set of irreducible components made it possible for Kashiwara and Saito in [KS97] to relate this variety to the usual quantum group associated to Kac-Moody algebras, via the notion of *crystals*. This later led Lusztig in [Lus00] to define a *semicanonical basis* of this quantum group, indexed by the irreducible components of these Lagrangian varieties.

There are more and more evidence of the relevance of the study of quivers with loops. A particular class of such quivers are the comet-shaped quivers, which have recently been used by Hausel, Letellier and Rodriguez Villegas in their study of the topology of character varieties, where the number of loops at the central vertex is the genus of the considered curve (see [HRV08] and [HLRV13]). We can also see quivers with loops appearing in a work of Nakajima relating quiver varieties with branching (see [Nak09]), as in the work of Okounkov and Maulik about quantum cohomology (see [MO12]).

Kang, Kashiwara and Schiffmann generalized these varieties in the framework of generalized Kac-Moody algebra in [KKS09], using quivers with loops. In this case, one has to impose a somewhat unnatural restriction on the regularity of the maps associated to the loops.

In this article we define a generalization of such Lagrangian varieties in the case of arbitrary quivers, possibly carrying loops. As opposed to the Lagrangian varieties constructed by Lusztig, which consisted in nilpotent representations, we have to consider here slightly more general representations. That this is necessary is already clear from the Jordan quiver case. Note that our Lagrangian variety is strictly larger than the one considered in [KKS09] and has many more irreducible components. Our proof of the Lagrangian character is also based on induction, but with non trivial first steps, consisting in the study of quivers with one vertex but possible loops. From our proof emerges a new combinatorial structure on the set of irreducible components, which is more general than the usual crystals, in that there are now more operators associated to a vertex with loops, see 1.14.

In a second section we study Nakajima varieties, still in the context of arbitrary quivers. We construct Lagrangian subvarieties, and generalize the notion of tensor product of their irreducible components, introduced by Nakajima in [Nak01]. The geometric statements obtained in the two first sections give the intuition of the way crystals and their tensor product should be generalized, which is done in a third part. The algebraic definition and study of the crystal $\mathcal{B}(\infty)$ enable us to define a semicanonical basis for the positive part of the generalized quantum group U^+ defined in [Boz13], where it is already equipped with a canonical basis, built *via* the theory of Lusztig perverse sheaves associated to quivers with loops. We finally use our study of Nakajima quiver varieties to produce a geometric realization of the generalized crystals $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$.

Acknowledgement. I would like to thank Olivier Schiffmann for his constant support and availability during the preparation of this work.

1. Lusztig quiver varieties

Let Q be a quiver, defined by a set of vertices I and a set of oriented edges $\Omega = \{h : s(h) \to t(h)\}$. We denote by $\bar{h} : t(h) \to s(h)$ the opposite arrow of $h \in \Omega$, and $\bar{Q}$ the quiver $(I, H = \Omega \sqcup \bar{\Omega})$, where $\bar{\Omega} = \{\bar{h} \mid h \in \Omega\}$: each arrow is replaced by a pair of arrows, one in each direction, and we set $\epsilon(h) = 1$ if $h \in \Omega$,

$\epsilon(h) = -1$ if $h \in \bar{\Omega}$. Note that the definition of $\bar{h}$ still makes sense if $h \in \bar{\Omega}$. We denote by $\Omega(i)$ the set of loops of Ω at i, and call i *imaginary* if $\omega_i = |\Omega(i)| \geq 1$, *real* otherwise. Denote by I^{im} (resp. I^{re}) the set of imaginary vertices (resp. real vertices). Finally, set $H(i) = \Omega(i) \sqcup \bar{\Omega}(i)$.

We work over the field of complex numbers $\mathbb{C}$.

For any pair of I-graded $\mathbb{C}$-vector spaces $V = (V_i)_{i\in I}$ and $V' = (V'_i)_{i\in I}$, we set:

$$\bar{E}(V, V') = \bigoplus_{h\in H} \mathrm{Hom}(V_{s(h)}, V'_{t(h)}).$$

For any dimension vector $\nu = (\nu_i)_{i\in I}$, we fix an I-graded $\mathbb{C}$-vector space V_ν of dimension ν, and put $\bar{E}_\nu = \bar{E}(V_\nu, V_\nu)$. The space $\bar{E}_\nu = \bar{E}(V_\nu, V_\nu)$ is endowed with a symplectic form:

$$\omega_\nu(x, x') = \sum_{h\in H} \mathrm{Tr}(\epsilon(h) x_h x'_{\bar{h}})$$

which is preserved by the natural action of $G_\nu = \prod_{i\in I} GL_{\nu_i}(\mathbb{C})$ on $\bar{E}_\nu$. The associated moment map $\mu_\nu : \bar{E}_\nu \to \mathfrak{g}_\nu = \oplus_{i\in I} \mathrm{End}(V_\nu)_i$ is given by:

$$\mu_\nu(x) = \sum_{h\in H} \epsilon(h) x_{\bar{h}} x_h.$$

Here we have identified $\mathfrak{g}_\nu^*$ with $\mathfrak{g}_\nu$ via the trace pairing.

Definition 1.1. An element $x \in \bar{E}_\nu$ is said to be *seminilpotent* if there exists an I-graded flag $\mathsf{W} = (\mathsf{W}_0 = V_\nu \supset \ldots \supset \mathsf{W}_r = \{0\})$ of V_ν such that:

$$\begin{array}{ll} x_h(\mathsf{W}_\bullet) \subseteq \mathsf{W}_{\bullet+1} & \text{if } h \in \Omega, \\ x_h(\mathsf{W}_\bullet) \subseteq \mathsf{W}_\bullet & \text{if } h \in \bar{\Omega}. \end{array}$$

We put $\Lambda(\nu) = \{x \in \mu_\nu^{-1}(0) \mid x \text{ seminilpotent}\}$.

Lemma 1.2. *The variety $\Lambda(\nu)$ is isotropic.*

Proof. We use the following general fact (see *e.g.* [KS94, §8.3]):

Proposition 1.3. *Let X be a smooth algebraic variety, Y a projective variety and Z a smooth closed algebraic subvariety of $X \times Y$. Consider the Lagrangian subvariety $\Lambda = T^*_Z(X \times Y)$ of $T^*(X \times Y)$. Then the image of the projection $q : \Lambda \cap (T^*X \times T^*_Y Y) \to T^*X$ is isotropic.*

We apply this result to $X = \oplus_{h\in\Omega} \mathrm{End}(V_{\nu_{s(h)}}, V_{\nu_{t(h)}})$, Y the I-graded flag variety of V_ν and:

$$Z = \{(x, \mathsf{W}) \in X \times Y \mid x(\mathsf{W}_\bullet) \subseteq \mathsf{W}_{\bullet+1}\}.$$

In this case, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} T^*X &= \bar{E}_\nu \\ T^*Y &= \{(\mathsf{W}, \xi) \in Y \times \mathfrak{g}_\nu \mid \xi(\mathsf{W}_\bullet) \subseteq \mathsf{W}_{\bullet+1}\} \\ \Lambda &= \left\{ (x, \mathsf{W}, \xi) \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} \xi = \sum_{h\in H} \epsilon(h) x_{\bar{h}} x_h \\ \forall h \in \Omega,\ x_h(\mathsf{W}_\bullet) \subseteq \mathsf{W}_{\bullet+1} \text{ and } x_{\bar{h}}(\mathsf{W}_\bullet) \subseteq \mathsf{W}_\bullet \end{array} \right\} \\ \mathrm{Im}\, q &= \left\{ x \in \bar{E}_\nu \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} \mu_\nu(x) = 0 \text{ and there exists } \mathsf{W} \in Y \text{ such that} \\ \forall h \in \Omega,\ x_h(\mathsf{W}_\bullet) \subseteq \mathsf{W}_{\bullet+1} \text{ and } x_{\bar{h}}(\mathsf{W}_\bullet) \subseteq \mathsf{W}_\bullet \end{array} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

hence $\Lambda(\nu) \subseteq \operatorname{Im} q$, which proves the lemma. □

1.1. **The case of the Jordan quiver.** This case is very well known. For $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$, we have:

$$\Lambda(\nu) = \{(x,y) \in (\operatorname{End}\mathbb{C}^\nu)^2 \mid x \text{ nilpotent and } [x,y]=0\} = \bigcup_\lambda T^*_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}(\operatorname{End}\mathbb{C}^\nu),$$

where $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ is the nilpotent orbit associated to the partition λ of ν. Therefore $\Lambda(\nu)$ is a Lagrangian subvariety of $(\operatorname{End}\mathbb{C}^\nu)^2$, and its irreducible components are the closures of the conormal bundles to the nilpotent orbits.

1.2. **The case of the quiver with one vertex and $g \geq 2$ loops.** For $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$, $\Lambda(\nu)$ is the subvariety of $(\operatorname{End}\mathbb{C}^\nu)^{2g}$ with elements $(x_i,y_i)_{1\leq i\leq g}$ such that:

- ▷ there exists a flag W of $\mathbb{C}^\nu$ such that $x_i(\mathsf{W}_\bullet) \subseteq \mathsf{W}_{\bullet+1}$ and $y_i(\mathsf{W}_\bullet) \subseteq \mathsf{W}_\bullet$;
- ▷ $\displaystyle\sum_{1\leq i\leq g} [x_i,y_i] = 0.$

We will denote by $\mathcal{C}_\nu$ the set of compositions of ν, *i.e.* tuples $\mathsf{c} = (\mathsf{c}_1,\dots,\mathsf{c}_r)$ of $\mathbb{N}_{>0}$ such that:

$$|\mathsf{c}| = \sum_{1\leq k\leq r} \mathsf{c}_k = \nu.$$

We will also often forget the index $1 \leq i \leq g$ in the rest of this section, which is dedicated to the proof of the following theorem:

Theorem 1.4. *The subvariety $\Lambda(\nu) \subseteq (\operatorname{End}\mathbb{C}^\nu)^{2g}$ is Lagrangian. Its irreducible components are parametrized by $\mathcal{C}_\nu$.*

Notations 1.5. For $(x_i,y_i) \in \Lambda(\nu)$, we define $\mathsf{W}_0(x_i,y_i) = \mathbb{C}^\nu$, then by induction $\mathsf{W}_{k+1}(x_i,y_i)$ the smallest subspace of $\mathbb{C}^\nu$ containing $\sum x_i(\mathsf{W}_k(x_i,y_i))$ and stable by (x_i,y_i). By seminilpotency, we can define r to be the first power such that $\mathsf{W}_r(x_i,y_i) = \{0\}$. Although r depends on (x_i,y_i) we don't write it explicitly.

Let $\mathsf{c}(x_i,y_i)$ denotes the composition associated to the flag $\mathsf{W}_\bullet(x_i,y_i)$:

$$\mathsf{c}_k(x_i,y_i) = \dim \frac{\mathsf{W}_{k-1}(x_i,y_i)}{\mathsf{W}_k(x_i,y_i)}.$$

For every $\mathsf{c} \in \mathcal{C}_\nu$, we define a locally closed subvariety:

$$\Lambda(\mathsf{c}) = \left\{(x_i,y_i) \in \Lambda(\nu) \mid \dim \frac{\mathsf{W}_{\bullet-1}(x_i,y_i)}{\mathsf{W}_\bullet(x_i,y_i)} = \mathsf{c}\right\} \subseteq \Lambda(\nu).$$

Then, if $\delta = (\delta_1,\dots,\delta_{r-1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{r-1}$, let $\Lambda(\mathsf{c})_\delta \subseteq \Lambda(\mathsf{c})$ be the locally closed subvariety defined by:

$$\dim\left(\bigcap_{1\leq i\leq g} \ker\left\{\xi \mapsto y_i^{(k)}\xi - \xi y_i^{(k+1)}\right\}\right) = \delta_k,$$

where:

$$y_i^{(k)} \in \operatorname{End}\left(\frac{\mathsf{W}_{k-1}(x_i,y_i)}{\mathsf{W}_k(x_i,y_i)}\right)$$

is induced by y_i and:

$$\xi \in \operatorname{Hom}\left(\frac{\mathsf{W}_k(x_i,y_i)}{\mathsf{W}_{k+1}(x_i,y_i)}, \frac{\mathsf{W}_{k-1}(x_i,y_i)}{\mathsf{W}_k(x_i,y_i)}\right).$$

Set $l = \mathsf{c}_1$, then:

$$\check{\Lambda}(\mathsf{c})_\delta = \left\{ (x_i, y_i, \mathfrak{X}, \beta, \gamma) \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} (x_i, y_i) \in \Lambda(\mathsf{c})_\delta \\ \mathsf{W}_1(x_i, y_i) \oplus \mathfrak{X} = \mathbb{C}^\nu \\ \beta : \mathsf{W}_1(x_i, y_i) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{C}^{\nu-l} \text{ and } \gamma : \mathfrak{X} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{C}^l \end{array} \right\},$$

and:

$$\pi_{\mathsf{c},\delta} \left| \begin{array}{l} \check{\Lambda}(\mathsf{c})_\delta \to \Lambda(\mathsf{c}^-)_{\delta^-} \times (\operatorname{End} \mathbb{C}^l)^g \\ (x_i, y_i, \mathfrak{X}, \beta, \gamma) \mapsto (\beta_*(x_i, y_i)_{\mathsf{W}_1}, \gamma_*(y_i)_{\mathfrak{X}})) \end{array} \right.$$

where $\mathsf{c}^- = (\mathsf{c}_2, \dots, \mathsf{c}_r)$ and $\delta^- = (\delta_2, \dots, \delta_{r-1})$. Let finally $(\Lambda(\mathsf{c}^-)_{\delta^-} \times (\operatorname{End} \mathbb{C}^l)^g)_{\mathsf{c},\delta}$ denote the image of $\pi_{\mathsf{c},\delta}$.

Proposition 1.6. *The morphism $\pi_{\mathsf{c},\delta}$ is smooth over its image, with connected fibers of dimension $\nu^2 + (2g-1)l(\nu-l) + \delta_1$ whenever $\Lambda(\mathsf{c})_\delta \neq \varnothing$.*

Proof. Let $(x_i, y_i, z_i) \in (\Lambda(\mathsf{c}^-)_{\delta^-} \times (\operatorname{End} \mathbb{C}^l)^g)_{\mathsf{c},\delta}$. Let $\mathfrak{W}$ and $\mathfrak{X}$ be two supplementary subspaces of $\mathbb{C}^\nu$ such that $\dim \mathfrak{X} = l$, together with two isomorphisms:

$$\beta : \mathfrak{W} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{C}^{\nu-l} \text{ and } \gamma : \mathfrak{X} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{C}^l.$$

We identify x_i, y_i and z_i with $\beta^*(x_i, y_i)$ and $\gamma^* z_i$, and define an element (X_i, Y_i) in the fiber of (x_i, y_i, z_i) by setting:

$$\begin{aligned} (X_i, Y_i)_{\mathfrak{W}} &= (x_i, y_i) \\ (X_i, Y_i)_{\mathfrak{X}} &= (0, z_i) \\ (X_i, Y_i)\big|_{\mathfrak{X}}^{\mathfrak{W}} &= (u_i, v_i) \in \operatorname{Hom}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{W})^{2g}. \end{aligned}$$

Then:

$$\mu_\nu(X_i, Y_i) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \phi(u_i, v_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{g} (x_i v_i + u_i z_i - y_i u_i) = 0,$$

and, for $\xi \in \operatorname{Hom}(\mathfrak{W}, \mathfrak{X})$:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall (u_i, v_i),\ \operatorname{Tr}(\xi \phi(u_i, v_i)) = 0 &\Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} \forall i, \forall u_i,\ \operatorname{Tr}(\xi(u_i z_i - y_i u_i)) = 0 \\ \forall i, \forall v_i,\ \operatorname{Tr}(\xi x_i v_i) = 0 \end{cases} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} \forall i, \forall u_i,\ \operatorname{Tr}((z_i \xi - \xi y_i) u_i) = 0 \\ \forall i, \forall v_i,\ \operatorname{Tr}(\xi x_i v_i) = 0 \end{cases} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} \forall i,\ z_i \xi = \xi y_i \\ \forall i,\ \xi x_i = 0 \end{cases} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} \mathsf{W}_1(x_i, y_i) \subseteq \ker \xi \\ \forall i,\ z_i \xi^{(1)} = \xi^{(1)} y_i^{(1)} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where $\xi^{(1)}$ denotes the map $\mathfrak{W}/\mathsf{W}_1(x_i, y_i) \to \mathfrak{X}$ induced by ξ. Since (x_i, y_i, z_i) is in the image of $\pi_{\mathsf{c},\delta}$, the image of ϕ is of codimension δ_1, and thus its kernel is of dimension $(2g-1)l(\nu-l) + \delta_1$.

Moreover, if we denote by $u_i^{(1)}$ the map $\mathfrak{X} \to \mathfrak{W}/\mathsf{W}_1(x_i, y_i)$ induced by u_i, $\mathsf{W}_1(X_i, Y_i) = \mathfrak{W}$ if and only if the space spanned by the action of $(y_i^{(1)})_i$ on $\sum_i \operatorname{Im} u_i^{(1)}$ is $\mathfrak{W}/\mathsf{W}_1(x_i, y_i)$. This condition defines an open subset of $\ker \phi$.

We end the proof noticing that the set of elements $(\mathfrak{W}, \mathfrak{X}, \beta, \gamma)$ is isomorphic to $GL_\nu(\mathbb{C})$. □

Proposition 1.7. *The variety $\Lambda(\mathsf{c})_0$ is not empty.*

Proof. Fix W of dimension c and define x_1 such that

$$x_1(\mathsf{W}_\bullet) \subseteq \mathsf{W}_{\bullet+1}$$
$$x_1{}^{|\mathsf{W}_k/\mathsf{W}_{k+1}}_{|\mathsf{W}_{k-1}/\mathsf{W}_k} \neq 0.$$

We define inductively an element y_1 stabilizing W such that:

- ▷ the action of ${y_1}^{(k+1)}$ on $\mathrm{Im}\left(x_1{}^{|\mathsf{W}_k/\mathsf{W}_{k+1}}_{|\mathsf{W}_{k-1}/\mathsf{W}_k}\right)$ spans $\mathsf{W}_k/\mathsf{W}_{k+1}$;
- ▷ $\mathrm{Spec}\, {y_1}^{(k)} \cap \mathrm{Spec}\, {y_1}^{(k+1)} = \varnothing$.

We finally set $x_2 = -x_1, y_2 = y_1$ and $x_i = y_i = 0$ for $i > 2$. This yields an element (x_i, y_i) in $\Lambda(\mathsf{c})_0$. □

Corollary 1.8. *For any $\mathsf{c} \in \mathcal{C}_\nu$, $\Lambda(\mathsf{c})_0$ is irreducible of dimension $g\nu^2$.*

Proof. We argue by induction on r. If $\mathsf{c} = (\nu)$, we have $\Lambda(\mathsf{c})_0 = \Lambda(\mathsf{c}) = (\mathrm{End}\,\mathbb{C}^\nu)^g$ which is irreducible of dimension $g\nu^2$. For the induction step, 1.6 and 1.7 ensure us that $\check{\Lambda}(\mathsf{c})_0$ is irreducible of dimension:

$$\nu^2 + (2g-1)l(\nu-l) + \dim(\Lambda(\mathsf{c}^-)_0 \times (\mathrm{End}\,\mathbb{C}^l)^g)_{\mathsf{c},0}$$
$$= \nu^2 + (2g-1)l(\nu-l) + g(\nu-l)^2 + gl^2$$

since $(\Lambda(\mathsf{c}^-)_0 \times (\mathrm{End}\,\mathbb{C}^l)^g)_{\mathsf{c},0}$ is a non empty subvariety of $\Lambda(\mathsf{c}^-)_0 \times (\mathrm{End}\,\mathbb{C}^l)^g$, irreducible of dimension $g(\nu-l)^2 + gl^2$ by our induction hypothesis. Moreover,

$$\check{\Lambda}(\mathsf{c})_0 \to \Lambda(\mathsf{c})_0$$

being a principal bundle with fibers of dimension $\nu^2 - l(\nu-l)$, we get that $\Lambda(\mathsf{c})_0$ is irreducible of dimension

$$\nu^2 + (2g-1)l(\nu-l) + g(\nu-l)^2 + gl^2 - \nu^2 + l(\nu-l) = g\nu^2.$$

□

Lemma 1.9. *Let V and W be two vector spaces, and $k \geq 0$. For any $(u, v) \in \mathrm{End}\, V \times \mathrm{End}\, W$, we set:*

$$\mathcal{C}(u,v) = \{x \in \mathrm{Hom}(V,W) \mid xu = vx\}$$
$$(\mathrm{End}\, V \times \mathrm{End}\, W)_k = \{(u,v) \in \mathrm{End}\, V \times \mathrm{End}\, W \mid \dim \mathcal{C}(u,v) = k\}.$$

Then we have

$$\mathrm{codim}(\mathrm{End}\, V \times \mathrm{End}\, W)_k \geq k.$$

Proof. The restriction of an endomorphism a to a generalized eigenspace associated to an eigenvalue η will be denoted by $a_\eta = \eta\,\mathrm{id} + \tilde{a}_\eta$. As usual, the nilpotent

orbit associated to a partition ξ will be denoted by $\mathcal{O}_\xi$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname{codim}(\operatorname{End} V \times \operatorname{End} W)_k \\
&= \operatorname{codim}\{(u,v) \mid \textstyle\sum_{\alpha,\beta} \dim \mathcal{C}(u_\alpha, v_\beta) = k\} \\
&= \operatorname{codim}\{(u,v) \mid \textstyle\sum_{\alpha \in \operatorname{Spec} u \cap \operatorname{Spec} v} \dim \mathcal{C}(u_\alpha, v_\alpha) = k\} \\
&= \operatorname{codim}\{(u,v) \mid \textstyle\sum_{\alpha} \dim \mathcal{C}(\tilde{u}_\alpha, \tilde{v}_\alpha) = k\} \\
&= \operatorname{codim}\left\{(u,v) \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} (\tilde{u}_\alpha, \tilde{v}_\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}_{\lambda_\alpha} \times \mathcal{O}_{\mu_\alpha} \\ \sum_\alpha \sum_j (\lambda'_\alpha)_j (\mu'_\alpha)_j = k \end{array}\right\}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname{codim}(\operatorname{End} V \times \operatorname{End} W)_k \geq k \\
&\Leftrightarrow \sum_\alpha (\operatorname{codim} \mathcal{O}_{\lambda_\alpha} + \operatorname{codim} \mathcal{O}_{\mu_\alpha} - 1) \geq \sum_\alpha \textstyle\sum_j (\lambda'_\alpha)_j (\mu'_\alpha)_j \\
&\Leftrightarrow \sum_\alpha (\textstyle\sum_j (\lambda'_\alpha)_j^2 + \sum_j (\mu'_\alpha)_j^2 - 1) \geq \sum_\alpha \textstyle\sum_j (\lambda'_\alpha)_j (\mu'_\alpha)_j,
\end{aligned}$$

which is clear. □

Proposition 1.10. *If $\delta \neq 0$, we have $\dim \Lambda(\mathsf{c})_\delta < g\nu^2$.*

Proof. It's enough to show that if $\delta_1 > 0$, we have:

$$\dim(\Lambda(\mathsf{c}^-)_{\delta^-} \times (\operatorname{End} \mathbb{C}^l)^g)_{\mathsf{c},\delta} + \delta_1 < \dim(\Lambda(\mathsf{c}^-)_0 \times (\operatorname{End} \mathbb{C}^l)^g).$$

This is a consequence of the previous lemma (recall that $g \geq 2$). Indeed, if we set :

$$((\operatorname{End} V)^g \times (\operatorname{End} W)^g)_k = \{(u_i, v_i) \mid \dim \cap_i \mathcal{C}(u_i, v_i) = k\},$$

we have:

$$((\operatorname{End} V)^g \times (\operatorname{End} W)^g)_k \subseteq \prod_{i=1}^g (\operatorname{End} V \times \operatorname{End} W)_{k_i}$$

for some $k_i \geq k$, and thus:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname{codim}((\operatorname{End} V)^g \times (\operatorname{End} W)^g)_k \\
&\qquad \geq \sum_i \operatorname{codim}(\operatorname{End} V \times \operatorname{End} W)_{k_i} \geq \sum_i k_i \geq gk > k.
\end{aligned}$$

□

The following proposition concludes the proof of theorem 1.4:

Proposition 1.11. *Every irreducible component of $\Lambda(\mathsf{c})$ is of dimension larger than or equal to $g\nu^2$.*

Proof. We first prove the result for the following variety:

$$\tilde{\Lambda}(\mathsf{c}) = \{((x_i, y_i), \mathsf{W}) \in \Lambda(\nu) \times Y_\mathsf{c} \mid x_i(\mathsf{W}_\bullet) \subseteq \mathsf{W}_{\bullet+1} \text{ and } y_i(\mathsf{W}_\bullet) \subseteq \mathsf{W}_\bullet\}$$

where Y_c denotes the variety of flags of $\mathbb{C}^\nu$ of dimension w. We use the following notations, analogous to 1.2:

$$\begin{aligned}
X &= \{(x_i)_{1 \leq i \leq g} \in (\operatorname{End} \mathbb{C}^\nu)^g\} \\
Z &= \{((x_i)_{1 \leq i \leq g}, \mathsf{W}) \mid x_i(\mathsf{W}_\bullet) \subseteq \mathsf{W}_{\bullet+1}\} \subseteq X \times Y_\mathsf{c}.
\end{aligned}$$

We get:

$$T^*X = \{(x_i, y_i)_{1\leq i\leq g} \in (\operatorname{End}\mathbb{C}^\nu)^{2g}\}$$
$$T^*Y_{\mathsf{c}} = \{(\mathsf{W}, K) \in Y_{\mathsf{c}} \times \operatorname{End}\mathbb{C}^\nu \mid K(\mathsf{W}_\bullet) \subseteq \mathsf{W}_{\bullet+1}\}$$

and:

$$T^*_Z(X \times Y_{\mathsf{c}}) = \left\{ ((x_i, y_i), \mathrm{F}, K) \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} \sum_{1\leq i\leq g} [x_i, y_i] = K \\ x_i(\mathsf{W}_\bullet) \subseteq \mathsf{W}_{\bullet+1} \text{ and } y_i(\mathsf{W}_\bullet) \subseteq \mathsf{W}_\bullet \end{array} \right\}$$

which is a pure Lagrangian subvariety of $T^*(X \times Y_{\mathsf{c}})$, of dimension $g\nu^2 + \dim Y_{\mathsf{c}}$. Since T^*Y_{c} is irreducible of dimension $2\dim Y_{\mathsf{c}}$, the irreducible components of the fibers of $T^*_Z(X\times Y_{\mathsf{c}}) \to T^*Y_{\mathsf{c}}$ are of dimension larger than or equal to $g\nu^2 - \dim Y_{\mathsf{c}}$. We denote by $\tilde{\Lambda}_{\mathsf{W}}$ the fiber above $(\mathsf{W}, 0)$, and by P the stabilizer of W in G_ν. Since G_ν and P are irreducible, we get that the components of:

$$\tilde{\Lambda}(\mathsf{c}) = G_\nu \times_P \tilde{\Lambda}_{\mathsf{W}}$$

are of dimension larger than or equal to $\dim Y_{\mathsf{c}} + (g\nu^2 - \dim Y_{\mathsf{c}}) = g\nu^2$.

We extend this result to $\Lambda(\mathsf{c})$, noticing that:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \Lambda(\mathsf{c}) & \hookrightarrow & \tilde{\Lambda}(\mathsf{c}) \\ (x_i, y_i) & \mapsto & (x_i, y_i, \mathsf{W}_\bullet(x_i, y_i)) \end{array}$$

defines an open embedding. □

1.3. **The general case.** Denote by $a_{i,j}$ the number of edges of Ω such that $s(h) = i$ and $t(h) = j$, and denote by:

$$C = (2\delta_{i,j} - a_{i,j} - a_{j,i})$$

the Cartan matrix of Q. For every $\nu, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^I$ and $j \in I$, we put:

$$\langle \nu, \beta \rangle = \sum_{i\in I} \nu_i\beta_i$$
$$e_j = (\delta_{i,j})_{i\in I}.$$

Definition 1.12. For every subset $i \in I$, and every $x \in \Lambda(\nu)$, we denote by $\mathfrak{I}_i(x)$ the subspace of V_ν spanned by the action of x on $\oplus_{j\neq i}V_j$. Then, for $l > 0$, we set:

$$\Lambda(\nu)_{i,l} = \{x \in \Lambda(\nu) \mid \operatorname{codim}\mathfrak{I}_i(x) = le_i\}.$$

Remark 1.13. By the definition of seminilpotency, we have:

$$\Lambda(\nu) = \bigcup_{i\in I, l\geq 1} \Lambda(\nu)_{i,l}.$$

Indeed, if $x \in \Lambda(\nu)$, there exists an I-graded flag $(\mathsf{W}_0 \supset \ldots \supset \mathsf{W}_r)$ such that (x, W) satisfies 1.1. Therefore there exists $i \in I$ and $l > 0$ such that $\mathsf{W}_0/\mathsf{W}_1 \simeq V_{le_i}$, and thus $x \in \cup_{k\geq l}\Lambda(\nu)_{i,k}$.

Proposition 1.14. *There exists a variety $\check{\Lambda}(\nu)_{i,l}$ and a diagram:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \check{\Lambda}(\nu)_{i,l} & \\ {\scriptstyle q_{i,l}}\swarrow & & \searrow{\scriptstyle p_{i,l}} \\ \Lambda(\nu)_{i,l} & & \Lambda(\nu - le_i)_{i,0} \times \Lambda(le_i) \end{array}$$

such that $p_{i,l}$ and $q_{i,l}$ are smooth with connected fibers, inducing a bijection:

$$\operatorname{Irr}\Lambda(\nu)_{i,l} \xrightarrow{\sim} \operatorname{Irr}\Lambda(\nu - le_i)_{i,0} \times \operatorname{Irr}\Lambda(le_i).$$

Proof. In this proof we will denote by $I(V, V')$ the set of I-graded isomorphisms between two I-graded spaces V and V' of same I-graded dimension. We set:

$$\check{\Lambda}(\nu)_{i,l} = \left\{ (x, \mathfrak{X}, \beta, \gamma) \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} x \in \Lambda(\nu)_{i,l} \\ \mathfrak{X}\ I\text{-graded and } \mathfrak{I}_i(x) \oplus \mathfrak{X} = V_\nu \\ \beta \in I(\mathfrak{I}_i(x), V_{\nu - le_i}) \text{ and } \gamma \in I(\mathfrak{X}, V_{le_i}) \end{array} \right\}$$

and:

$$p_{i,l} \left| \begin{array}{l} \check{\Lambda}(\nu)_{i,l} \to \Lambda(\nu - le_i)_{i,0} \times \Lambda(le_i) \\ (x, \mathfrak{X}, \beta, \gamma) \mapsto (\beta_*(x_{\mathfrak{I}_i(x)}), \gamma_*(x_{\mathfrak{X}})). \end{array} \right.$$

We study the fibers of $p_{i,l}$: take $y \in \Lambda(\nu - le_i)_{i,0}$ and $z \in \Lambda(le_i)$ and consider $\mathfrak{I}$ and $\mathfrak{X}$ two supplementary I-graded subspaces of V_ν such that $\dim \mathfrak{X} = le_i$, together with two isomorphisms:

$$\beta \in I(\mathfrak{I}, V_{\nu - le_i}) \text{ and } \gamma \in I(\mathfrak{X}, V_{le_i}).$$

We identify y and z with $\beta^* y$ and $\gamma^* z$, and we define a preimage x by setting $x|^{\mathfrak{I}}_{\mathfrak{I}} = y$, $x|^{\mathfrak{X}}_{\mathfrak{X}} = z$ and $x|^{\mathfrak{I}}_{\mathfrak{X}} = \eta \in \bar{E}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{I})$. In order to get $\mu_\nu(x) = 0$, η must satisfy the following relation:

$$\phi(\eta) = \sum_{h \in H : s(h) = i} \epsilon(h)(y_{\bar{h}}\eta_h + \eta_{\bar{h}} z_h) = 0.$$

We need to show that ϕ is surjective to conclude. Consider $\xi \in \operatorname{Hom}(\mathfrak{I}_i, \mathfrak{X}_i)$ such that $\operatorname{Tr}(\phi(\eta)\xi) = 0$ for every η. For every edge h such that $s(h) = i \neq j = t(h)$ and every η_h, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \operatorname{Tr}(y_{\bar{h}}\eta_h\xi) \\ &= \operatorname{Tr}(\xi y_{\bar{h}}\eta_h) \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\xi y_{\bar{h}} = 0$, and $\operatorname{Im} y_{\bar{h}} \subseteq \ker \xi$. Now consider a loop $h \in H(i)$. For every η_h, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \operatorname{Tr}\left((\eta_h z_{\bar{h}} - y_{\bar{h}}\eta_h)\xi\right) \\ &= \operatorname{Tr}\left(\eta_h(z_{\bar{h}}\xi - \xi y_{\bar{h}})\right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\xi y_{\bar{h}} = z_{\bar{h}}\xi$ and therefore $\ker \xi$ is stable by $y_{\bar{h}}$. As $\operatorname{codim} \mathfrak{I}_i(y) = 0$, we get $\xi = 0$, which finishes the proof. □

We can now state the following theorem, which answers a question asked in [Li]:

Theorem 1.15. *The subvariety $\Lambda(\nu)$ of $\bar{E}_\nu$ is Lagrangian.*

Proof. Since this subvariety is isotropic by 1.2 we just have to show that the irreducible components of $\Lambda(\nu)$ are of dimension $\langle \nu, (1 - C/2)\nu \rangle$. We proceed by induction on ν, the first step corresponding to the one vertex quiver case which has already been treated: we have seen that $\Lambda(le_i)$ is of dimension $\langle le_i, (1 - C/2)le_i \rangle$.

Next, consider $C \in \operatorname{Irr}\Lambda(\nu)$ for some ν. By 1.13, there exists $i \in I$ and $l \geq 1$ such that $C \cap \Lambda(\nu)_{i,l}$ is dense in C. Let $\check{C} = (C_1, C_2)$ the couple of irreducible components corresponding to C via the bijection obtained in 1.14:

$$\operatorname{Irr}\Lambda(\nu)_{i,l} \xrightarrow{\sim} \operatorname{Irr}\Lambda(\nu - le_i)_{i,0} \times \operatorname{Irr}\Lambda(le_i).$$

We also know by the proof of 1.14 that the fibers of $p_{i,l}$ are of dimension:

$$\langle \nu, \nu \rangle + \langle \nu - le_i, (1-C)le_i \rangle.$$

Since $q_{i,l}$ is a principal bundle with fibers of dimension $\langle \nu, \nu \rangle - \langle le_i, \nu - le_i \rangle$, we get:

$$\dim C = \dim \check{C} + \langle \nu - le_i, (2-C)le_i \rangle.$$

But $\Lambda(\nu - le_i)_{i,0}$ is open in $\Lambda(\nu - le_i)$, so we can use our induction hypothesis and the first step to write:

$$\dim \check{C} = \langle \nu - le_i, (1-C/2)(\nu - le_i) \rangle + \langle le_i, (1-C/2)le_i \rangle$$

and thus obtain:

$$\dim C = \langle \nu, (1-C/2)\nu \rangle.$$

□

1.4. **Constructible functions.** Following [Lus00], we denote by $\mathcal{M}(\nu)$ the $\mathbb{Q}$-vector space of constructible functions $\Lambda(\nu) \to \mathbb{Q}$, which are constant on any G_ν-orbit. Put $\mathcal{M} = \oplus_{\nu \geq 0} \mathcal{M}(\nu)$, which is a graded algebra once equipped with the product $*$ defined in [Lus00, 2.1].

For $Z \in \operatorname{Irr}\Lambda(\nu)$ and $f \in \mathcal{M}(\nu)$, we put $\rho_Z(f) = c$ if $Z \cap f^{-1}(c)$ is an open dense subset of Z.

If $i \in I^{\mathrm{im}}$ and (l) denotes the trivial composition or partition of l, we denote by $1_{i,l}$ the characteristic function of the associated irreducible component $Z_{i,(l)} \in \operatorname{Irr}\Lambda(le_i)$ (the component of elements x such that $x_h = 0$ for any loop $h \in \Omega(i)$). If $i \notin I^{\mathrm{im}}$, we just denote by 1_i the function mapping to 1 the only point in $\Lambda(e_i)$.

We have $1_{i,l} \in \mathcal{M}(le_i)$ for $i \in I^{\mathrm{im}}$ and $1_i \in \mathcal{M}(e_i)$ for $i \notin I^{\mathrm{im}}$. We denote by $\mathcal{M}_\circ \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ the subalgebra generated by these functions.

Lemma 1.16. *Suppose Q has one vertex $\circ$ and $g \geq 1$ loop(s). For every $Z \in \operatorname{Irr}\Lambda(\nu)$ there exists $f \in \mathcal{M}_\circ(\nu)$ such that $\rho_Z(f) = 1$ and $\rho_{Z'}(f) = 0$ for $Z' \neq Z$.*

Proof. We denote by Z_{c} the irreducible component associated to the partition (resp. composition) c of ν if $g = 1$ (resp. $g \geq 2$). By convention, if $g = 1$, Z_{c} will denote the component associated to the orbit $\mathcal{O}_{\mathsf{c}}$ defined by:

$$x \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathsf{c}} \Leftrightarrow \dim \ker x^i = \sum_{1 \leq k \leq i} \mathsf{c}_k.$$

If $g \geq 2$, we remark that by trace duality, we can assume that Z_{c} is the closure of $\Lambda^{\check{}}_{\mathsf{c}}$ defined by:

$$(x_i, y_i)_{1 \leq i \leq g} \in \Lambda^{\check{}}_{\mathsf{c}} \Leftrightarrow \dim \mathbf{K}_i = \sum_{1 \leq k \leq i} \mathsf{c}_k$$

where we define by induction $\mathrm{K}_0 = \{0\}$, then K_{j+1} as the biggest subspace of $\cap_i x_i^{-1}(\mathrm{K}_j)$ stable by (x_i, y_i). From now on, $\mathsf{c} = (\mathsf{c}_1, \dots, \mathsf{c}_r)$ will denote indistinctly a partition or a composition depending on the value of g. We define an order by:

$$\mathsf{c} \preceq \mathsf{c}' \text{ if and only if for any } i \geq 1 \text{ we have } \sum_{1 \leq k \leq i} \mathsf{c}_k \leq \sum_{1 \leq k \leq i} \mathsf{c}'_k.$$

Therefore, setting $\tilde{1}_{\mathsf{c}} = 1_{\mathsf{c}_r} * \cdots * 1_{\mathsf{c}_1}$, where $1_l = 1_{\circ,l}$, we get:

$$x \in Z_{\mathsf{c}},\ \tilde{1}_{\mathsf{c}'}(x) \neq 0 \ \Rightarrow\ \mathsf{c}' \preceq \mathsf{c}.$$

For $\mathsf{c} = (\nu)$ we have $\tilde{1}_{\mathsf{c}} = 1_\nu$ which is the characteristic function of Z_{c}, and we put $1_{\mathsf{c}} = \tilde{1}_{\mathsf{c}}$ in this case. Then, by induction:

$$1_{\mathsf{c}} = \tilde{1}_{\mathsf{c}} - \sum_{\mathsf{c}' \prec \mathsf{c}} \rho_{Z_{\mathsf{c}'}}(\tilde{1}_{\mathsf{c}}) 1_{\mathsf{c}'}$$

has the expected property. □

Notations 1.17.

- ▷ From now on, if c corresponds to an irreducible component of $\Lambda(|\mathsf{c}|e_i)$, we will note $1_{i,\mathsf{c}}$ the function corresponding to 1_{c} in the previous proof.
- ▷ For $Z \in \operatorname{Irr} \Lambda(\nu)_{i,l}$, we denote by $\epsilon_i(Z) \in \operatorname{Irr} \Lambda(le_i)$ the composition of the second projection with the bijection obtained in 1.14. Note that $|\epsilon_i(Z)| = l$.

Proposition 1.18. *For every $Z \in \operatorname{Irr} \Lambda(\nu)$, there exists $f \in \mathcal{M}_\circ(\nu)$ such that $\rho_Z(f) = 1$ and $\rho_{Z'}(f) = 0$ if $Z' \neq Z$.*

Proof. We proceed as in [Lus00, lemma 2.4], by induction on ν. The first step consists in 1.16. Then, consider $Z \in \operatorname{Irr} \Lambda(\nu)$. There exists $i \in I$ and $l > 0$ such that $Z \cap \Lambda(\nu)_{i,l}$ is dense in Z.

We now proceed by descending induction on l. There's nothing to say if $l > \nu_i$.

Otherwise, let $(Z', Z_{\mathsf{c}}) \in \operatorname{Irr} \Lambda(\nu - le_i)_{i,0} \times \operatorname{Irr} \Lambda(le_i)$ be the pair of components corresponding to Z. By the induction hyopthesis on ν, there exists $g \in \mathcal{M}_\circ(\nu - le_i)$ such that $\rho_{\overline{Z'}}(g) = 1$ and $\rho_Y(g) = 0$ if $\overline{Z'} \neq Y \in \operatorname{Irr} \Lambda(\nu - le_i)$.

Then we set $\tilde{f} = 1_{i,\mathsf{c}} * g \in \mathcal{M}_\circ(\nu)$, and get:

- $\rho_Z(\tilde{f}) = 1$,
- $\rho_{Z'}(\tilde{f}) = 0$ if $Z' \in \operatorname{Irr} \Lambda(\nu) \setminus Z$ satisfies $|\epsilon_i(Z')| = l$,
- $\tilde{f}(x) = 0$ if $x \in \Lambda(\nu)_{i,<l}$ so that $\rho_{Z'}(\tilde{f}) = 0$ if $|\epsilon_i(Z')| < l$.

If $|\epsilon_i(Z')| > l$, we use the induction hypothesis on l: there exists $f_{Z'} \in \mathcal{M}_\circ(\nu)$ such that $\rho_{Z'}(f_{Z'}) = 1$ and $\rho_{Z''}(f_{Z'}) = 0$ if $Z'' \in \operatorname{Irr} \Lambda(\nu) \setminus Z'$. We end the proof by setting:

$$f = \tilde{f} - \sum_{Z' : |\epsilon_i(Z')| > l} \rho_{Z'}(\tilde{f}) f_{Z'}.$$

□

2. NAKAJIMA QUIVER VARIETIES

Fix an I-graded vector space W of dimension $\lambda = (\lambda_i)_{i\in I}$. For any dimension vector $\nu = (\nu_i)_{i\in I}$, we still fix an I-graded $\mathbb{C}$-vector space $V_\nu = ((V_\nu)_i = V_{\nu_i e_i})_{i\in I}$ of dimension ν. We will denote by $(x, f, g) = ((x_h)_{h\in H}, (f_i)_{i\in I}, (g_i)_{i\in I})$ the elements of the following space:

$$E(V,\lambda) = \bar{E}(V,V) \oplus \bigoplus_{i\in I} \mathrm{Hom}(V_i, W_i) \bigoplus_{i\in I} \mathrm{Hom}(W_i, V_i)$$

defined for any I-graded space V, and put $E_{\nu,\lambda} = E(V_\nu, \lambda)$ for any dimension vector ν. This space is endowed with a symplectic form:

$$\omega_{\nu,\lambda}\big((x,f,g),(x',f',g')\big) = \sum_{h\in H} \mathrm{Tr}(\epsilon(h)x_h x'_{\bar{h}}) + \sum_{i\in I} \mathrm{Tr}(g_i f'_i - g'_i f_i)$$

which is preserved by the natural action of $G_\nu = \prod_{i\in I} GL_{\nu_i}(\mathbb{C})$ on $E_{\nu,\lambda}$. The associated moment map $\mu_{\nu,\lambda} : E_{\nu,\lambda} \to \mathfrak{g}_\nu = \oplus_{i\in I} \mathrm{End}(V_\nu)_i$ is given by:

$$\mu_{\nu,\lambda}(x,f,g) = \Big(g_i f_i + \sum_{h\in H : s(h)=i} \epsilon(h) x_{\bar{h}} x_h\Big)_{i\in I}.$$

Here we have identified $\mathfrak{g}_\nu^*$ with $\mathfrak{g}_\nu$ via the trace pairing. Put:

$$\mathsf{M}_\circ(\nu,\lambda) = \mu_{\nu,\lambda}^{-1}(0).$$

Definition 2.1. Set $\chi : G_\nu \to \mathbb{C}^*$, $(g_i)_{i\in I} \mapsto \prod_{i\in I} \det^{-1} g_i$. We denote by:

$$\mathfrak{M}_\circ(\nu,\lambda) = \mathsf{M}_\circ(\nu,\lambda)/\!\!/G_\nu$$
$$\mathfrak{M}(\nu,\lambda) = \mathsf{M}_\circ(\nu,\lambda)/_\chi G_\nu$$

the geometric and symplectic quotients (with respect to χ).

Proposition 2.2. *An element $(x,f,g) \in \mathsf{M}_\circ(\nu,\lambda)$ is stable with respect to χ if and only if the only x-stable subspace of $\ker f$ is $\{0\}$. Set:*

$$\mathsf{M}(\nu,\lambda) = \{(x,f,g) \in \mathsf{M}_\circ(\nu,\lambda) \mid (x,f,g) \text{ stable}\},$$

then $\mathfrak{M}(\nu,\lambda) = \mathsf{M}(\nu,\lambda)/\!\!/G_\nu$.

2.1. **A crystal-type structure.**

Definition 2.3. An element $(x,f,g) \in E_{\nu,\lambda}$ is said to be *seminilpotent* if $x \in \bar{E}_\nu$ is, according to 1.1. We put:

$$\mathsf{L}_\circ(\nu,\lambda) = \{(x,f,0) \in \mathsf{M}_\circ(\nu,\lambda) \mid x \text{ seminilpotent}\} \subseteq \mathsf{M}_\circ(\nu,\lambda)$$

and define $\mathsf{L}(\nu,\lambda) \subseteq \mathsf{M}(\nu,\lambda)$ in the same way. Finally set:

$$\mathfrak{L}_\circ(\nu,\lambda) = \mathsf{L}_\circ(\nu,\lambda)/\!\!/G_\nu$$
$$\mathfrak{L}(\nu,\lambda) = \mathsf{L}_\circ(\nu,\lambda)/_\chi G_\nu = \mathsf{L}(\nu,\lambda)/\!\!/G_\nu.$$

We will simply denote by (x,f) the elements of $\mathsf{L}_\circ(\nu,\lambda)$.

There is an alternative definition of $\mathfrak{L}(\nu,\lambda)$. Define a $\mathbb{C}^*$-action on $\mathfrak{M}(\nu,\lambda)$ by:

$$t \diamond [x,f,g] = [t^{(1+\epsilon)/2}x, f, tg].$$

We have:

$$\mathfrak{L}(\nu,\lambda) = \{[x,f,g] \mid \exists \lim_{t\to\infty} t\diamond[x,f,g]\}.$$

By the same arguments than in [Nak94, 5.8], we have the following:

Proposition 2.4. *The subvariety $\mathfrak{L}(\nu,\lambda) \subset \mathfrak{M}(\nu,\lambda)$ is Lagrangian.*

Note that since we consider seminilpotents instead of nilpotents, we still have:

$$\omega_{\nu,\lambda}(t \diamond -, -) = t\omega_{\nu,\lambda}.$$

Definition 2.5. For every subset $i \in I$, and every $(x,f,g) \in \mathsf{M}_\circ(\nu,\lambda)$, we denote by $\mathfrak{I}_i(x,f,g)$ the subspace of V_ν spanned by the action of $x \oplus g$ on $(\oplus_{j\neq i} V_j) \oplus W_i$. Then, for $l \geq 0$, we set:

$$\mathsf{M}_\circ(\nu,\lambda)_{i,l} = \{x \in \mathsf{M}_\circ(\nu,\lambda) \mid \operatorname{codim} \mathfrak{I}_i(x,f,g) = le_i\}.$$

We define $\mathsf{M}(\nu,\lambda)_{i,l}$, $\mathsf{L}_\circ(\nu,\lambda)_{i,l}$ and $\mathsf{L}(\nu,\lambda)_{i,l}$ in the same way. The quantity $\operatorname{codim} \mathfrak{I}_i(x,f,g)$ being stable on G_ν-orbits, the notations $\mathfrak{M}_\circ(\nu,\lambda)_{i,l}$, $\mathfrak{M}(\nu,\lambda)_{i,l}$, $\mathfrak{L}_\circ(\nu,\lambda)_{i,l}$ and $\mathfrak{L}(\nu,\lambda)_{i,l}$ also make sense.

Remark 2.6.

- As in 1.13, we have:
$$\mathsf{L}_\circ(\nu,\lambda) = \bigsqcup_{i\in I, l\geq 1} \mathsf{L}_\circ(\nu,\lambda)_{i,l}.$$
- Note that $\mathsf{L}_\circ(le_i,0) = \Lambda(le_i)$.

Proposition 2.7. *There exists a variety $\check{\mathsf{M}}_\circ(\nu,\lambda)_{i,l}$ and a diagram:*

(2.8)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \check{\mathsf{M}}_\circ(\nu,\lambda)_{i,l} & \\ {\scriptstyle q_{i,l}}\swarrow & & \searrow{\scriptstyle p_{i,l}} \\ \mathsf{M}_\circ(\nu,\lambda)_{i,l} & & \mathsf{M}_\circ(\nu - le_i,\lambda)_{i,0} \times \mathsf{M}_\circ(le_i,0) \end{array}$$

such that $p_{i,l}$ and $q_{i,l}$ are smooth with connected fibers, inducing a bijection:

$$\operatorname{Irr} \mathsf{M}_\circ(\nu,\lambda)_{i,l} \xrightarrow{\sim} \operatorname{Irr} \mathsf{M}_\circ(\nu - le_i,\lambda)_{i,0} \times \operatorname{Irr} \mathsf{M}_\circ(le_i,0).$$

Proof. In this proof we will denote by $I(V,V')$ the set of I-graded isomorphisms between two I-graded spaces V and V' of same I-graded dimension. We set:

$$\check{\mathsf{M}}_\circ(\nu,\lambda)_{i,l} = \left\{ (x,f,g,\mathfrak{X},\beta,\gamma) \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} (x,f,g) \in \mathsf{M}_\circ(\nu,\lambda)_{i,l} \\ \mathfrak{X}\ I\text{-graded and } \mathfrak{I}_i(x,f,g) \oplus \mathfrak{X} = V_\nu \\ \beta \in I(\mathfrak{I}_i(x,f,g), V_{\nu - le_i}) \\ \gamma \in I(\mathfrak{X}, V_{le_i}) \end{array} \right\}$$

and:

$$p_{i,l} \left| \begin{array}{l} \check{\mathsf{M}}_\circ(\nu,\lambda)_{i,l} \to \mathsf{M}_\circ(\nu - le_i,\lambda)_{i,0} \times \mathsf{M}_\circ(le_i,0) \\ (x,f,g,\mathfrak{X},\beta,\gamma) \mapsto (\beta_*(xf,g)_{\mathfrak{I}_i(x,f,g)}, \gamma_*(x,f,g)_{\mathfrak{X}}). \end{array} \right.$$

We study the fibers of $p_{i,l}$: take $(x,f,g) \in \mathsf{M}_\circ(\nu - le_i,\lambda)_{i,0}$ and $(z,0,0) \in \mathsf{M}_\circ(le_i,0)$ and consider $\mathfrak{I}$ and $\mathfrak{X}$ two supplementary I-graded subspaces of V_ν such that $\dim \mathfrak{X} = le_i$, together with two isomorphisms:

$$\beta \in I(\mathfrak{I}, V_{\nu - le_i}) \text{ and } \gamma \in I(\mathfrak{X}, V_{le_i}).$$

We identify (x,f,g) and z with $\beta^*(x,f,g)$ and $\gamma^* z$, and we define a preimage (X,F,G) by setting $(X,F,G)\big|^{\mathfrak{I}\oplus W}_{\mathfrak{I}\oplus W} = (x,f,g)$, $X\big|^{\mathfrak{X}}_{\mathfrak{X}} = z$ and:

$$(X,F)\big|^{\mathfrak{I}\oplus W}_{\mathfrak{X}} = (\eta,\theta) \in \bar{E}(\mathfrak{X},\mathfrak{I}) \oplus \operatorname{Hom}(\mathfrak{X}_i, W_i).$$

In order to get $\mu_{\nu,\lambda}(X,F,G)=0$, (η,θ) must satisfy the following relation:

$$\psi(\eta,\theta)=\sum_{h\in H:s(h)=i}\epsilon(h)(x_{\bar{h}}\eta_h+\eta_{\bar{h}}z_h)+g_i\theta_i=0.$$

We need to show that ψ is surjective to conclude. Consider $\xi\in\mathrm{Hom}(\mathfrak{I}_i,\mathfrak{X}_i)$ such that $\mathrm{Tr}(\psi(\eta,\theta)\xi)=0$ for every (η,θ). Then we have for every edge $h\in H$ such that $s(h)=i\neq j=t(h)$ and for every η_h:

$$\begin{aligned}0&=\mathrm{Tr}(x_{\bar{h}}\eta_h\xi)\\&=\mathrm{Tr}(\eta_h\xi x_{\bar{h}}).\end{aligned}$$

Hence $\xi x_{\bar{h}}=0$ and $\mathrm{Im}\,x_{\bar{h}}\subseteq\ker\xi$. We also have $\mathrm{Tr}(g_i\theta_i\xi)=0$ for every θ_i, so we similarly get $\mathrm{Im}\,g_i\subseteq\ker\xi$. Now consider a loop $h\in H$ at i. We have for every η_h:

$$\begin{aligned}0&=\mathrm{Tr}\left((x_{\bar{h}}\eta_h-\eta_h z_{\bar{h}})\xi\right)\\&=\mathrm{Tr}\left(\eta_h(\xi x_{\bar{h}}-z_{\bar{h}}\xi)\right),\end{aligned}$$

hence $\xi x_{\bar{h}}=z_{\bar{h}}\xi$ and therefore $\ker\xi$ is stable by $x_{\bar{h}}$. Since $(x,f,g)\in\mathsf{M}_\circ(\nu-le_i,\lambda)_{i,0}$, we get $\xi=0$, which finishes the proof. □

Corollary 2.9. *We also have a bijection:*

$$\mathsf{I}_\circ(\nu,\lambda)_{i,l}:\mathrm{Irr}\,\mathsf{L}_\circ(\nu,\lambda)_{i,l}\xrightarrow{\sim}\mathrm{Irr}\,\mathsf{L}_\circ(\nu-le_i,\lambda)_{i,0}\times\mathrm{Irr}\,\mathsf{L}_\circ(le_i,0).$$

Proof. The image of a seminilpotent element by $p_{i,l}$ is a pair of seminilpotent elements, and the fiber of $p_{i,l}$ over a pair of seminilpotent elements consists in seminilpotent elements. □

2.2. **Extension to the stable locus.** We will often use the following well-known fact:

Lemma 2.10. *Consider $y\in\mathrm{End}\,\mathfrak{I}$ and $z\in\mathrm{End}\,\mathfrak{X}$ such that $\mathrm{Spec}\,y\cap\mathrm{Spec}\,z=\varnothing$. If $\mathbb{C}[y].v=\mathfrak{I}$ and $\mathbb{C}[z].v'=\mathfrak{X}$ for some $v\in\mathfrak{I}$ and $v'\in\mathfrak{X}$, then $\mathbb{C}[y\oplus z].v\oplus v'=\mathfrak{I}\oplus\mathfrak{X}$.*

Notations 2.11. Let i be imaginary and put $\Omega(i)=\{b_1,\dots,b_{\omega_i}\}$. For every $(x,f)\in\mathsf{L}_\circ(\nu,\lambda)$, we set $\sigma_i(x)=x^*_{\bar{b}_1}$, where $*$ stands for the duality:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{End}\,V\to\mathrm{End}\,V^*=\mathrm{End}\left(\mathrm{Hom}(V,\mathbb{C})\right)\\u\mapsto u^*=[\phi\mapsto\phi\circ u]\end{aligned}$$

for every $\mathbb{C}$-vector space V.

Lemma 2.12. *For every $C\in\mathrm{Irr}\,\Lambda(le_i)$, there exists $x\in C$ such that:*

$$\exists\psi\in V^*_{le_i},\mathbb{C}[\sigma_i(x)].\psi=V^*_{le_i}.$$

Proof. It's a consequence of sections 1.1 and 1.2. If $\omega_i=1$ and λ is a partition of l, denote by μ the conjugate partition of λ. Let $x\in\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ be defined in a base:

$$e=(e_{1,1},\dots,e_{1,\mu_1},\dots,e_{r,1},\dots,e_{r,\mu_r})$$

by:

$$x^*_{b_1} = \begin{pmatrix} J_{\mu_1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & & & 0 \\ \vdots & & & \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & J_{\mu_r} \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } x^*_{\bar{b}_1} = \begin{pmatrix} t_1 I_{\mu_1} + J_{\mu_1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & & & 0 \\ \vdots & & & \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & t_r I_{\mu_r} + J_{\mu_r} \end{pmatrix}$$

where the t_i are all distinct and nonzero, and:

$$J_p = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & & & & 0 \\ \vdots & & & & 1 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is enough to consider ψ with nonzero coordinates relatively to $(e_{1,\mu_1}, \dots, e_{r,\mu_r})$ to get $\mathbb{C}[\sigma_i(x)].\psi = V^*_{le_i}$. If $\omega_i \geq 2$, we use the proof of 1.7: in any irreducible component we can define x such that there exists v such tat $\mathbb{C}[x_{\bar{b}_1}].v = V_{le_i}$ ($x_{\bar{b}_i}$ corresponds to y_i in the aforementioned proof, x_{b_i} to x_i). We get the result by duality. □

Remark 2.13. Note that the case $\omega_i = 1$ is very well known since it corresponds to the case of the Hilbert scheme of points in the plane.

Definition 2.14. Set:

$$\mathsf{L}(\lambda) := \bigcup_{\nu} \mathsf{L}(\nu, \lambda) \subseteq \bigcup_{\nu} \mathsf{L}_\circ(\nu, \lambda) =: \mathsf{L}_\circ(\lambda),$$

and define $\mathrm{B}(\lambda)$ as the smallest subset of $\operatorname{Irr} \mathsf{L}_\circ(\lambda)$ containing the only element of $\operatorname{Irr} \mathsf{L}_\circ(0, \lambda)$, and stable by the $\mathsf{I}_\circ(\nu, \lambda)^{-1}_{i,l}(-, \operatorname{Irr} \Lambda(le_i))$ for ν, i, l such that:

- $\langle e_i, \lambda - C\nu \rangle \geq -l$ if $i \in I^{\mathrm{re}}$,
- $\lambda_i + \sum_{h \in H_i} \nu_{t(h)} > 0$ if $i \in I^{\mathrm{im}}$

where $H_i = \{h \in H \mid i = s(h) \neq t(h)\}$.

Lemma 2.15. *For every $i \in I^{\mathrm{im}}$, we write $\Omega(i) = \{b_{i,1}, \dots, b_{i,\omega_i}\}$. For every $C \in \mathrm{B}(\lambda)$, there exists $(x, f) \in C$ such that:*

$$\begin{cases} (x, f) \text{ stable} \\ \forall i \in I^{\mathrm{im}}, \exists \phi_i \in W^*_i \oplus (\oplus_{h \in H_i} V^*_{\nu_{t(h)}}), \mathbb{C}[\sigma_i(x)].\Sigma_i(x, f)(\phi_i) = V^*_{\nu_i} \end{cases} \tag{2.16}$$

where $\Sigma_i(x, f) = f^*_i + \sum_{h \in H_i} x^*_h$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on ν, with first step consisting in the case of $C \in \mathrm{B}(\lambda) \cap \operatorname{Irr} \mathsf{L}_\circ(le_i, \lambda)$ for some $l > 0$. If $i \notin I^{\mathrm{im}}$, we have $l \leq \lambda_i$ by definition of $\mathrm{B}(\lambda)$, hence we can find $(x, f) \in C$ such that 2.16 since it's equivalent here to f injective. If $i \in I^{\mathrm{im}}$, we have $\lambda_i > 0$ by definition of $\mathrm{B}(\lambda)$, and we can use 2.12.

Now consider $C \in \mathrm{B}(\lambda) \cap \operatorname{Irr} \mathsf{L}_\circ(\nu, \lambda)_{i,l}$ for some ν and $l > 0$, and set $(C_1, C_2) = \mathsf{I}_\circ(\nu, \lambda)_{i,l}(C)$. First assume that $i \notin I^{\mathrm{im}}$. Thanks to the induction hypothesis, we can pick $((x, f), z) \in C_1 \times C_2$ such that (x, f) satisfies 2.16. Following the notations used in the proof of 2.7, we build an element of C satisfying 2.16 by chosing (η, θ) such that $\theta + \sum_{h \in H_i} \eta_h$ is injective with values in a supplementary of

$\mathrm{Im}(f_i+\sum_{h\in H_i} x_h)$ in $W_i\oplus\ker(\sum_{h\in H_i} x_{\bar{h}})$: it's possible since $l+\langle e_i, \lambda-C\nu\rangle \geq 0$ by definition of $\mathrm{B}(\lambda)$.

If $i \in I^{\mathrm{im}}$, take $(x, f) \in C_1$ satisfying 2.16 and $z \in C_2$ such that:

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{Spec} x_{\bar{b}_{i,1}} \cap \operatorname{Spec} z_{\bar{b}_{i,1}} = \varnothing \\ \exists \psi \in V^*_{le_i}, \mathbb{C}[\sigma_i(z)].\psi = V^*_{le_i}, \end{cases}$$

which is possible, thanks to 2.12. Still following the notations of the proof of 2.7, we build an element of C mapped to $((x, f), z)$ by considering (η, θ) such that:

$$\Big(\theta^* + \sum_{h\in H_i} \eta^*_h\Big)(\phi_i) = \psi$$

where $\phi_i \in W_i^* \oplus (\oplus_{h\in H_i} V^*_{\nu_{t(h)}})$ satisfies $\mathbb{C}[\sigma_i(x)].\Sigma_i(x, f)(\phi_i) = \mathfrak{I}^*$ (we use the induction hypothesis), which is possible even if $\mathfrak{I} = \{0\}$ since we have $W_i^* \oplus (\oplus_{h\in H_i} V^*_{\nu_{t(h)}}) \neq \{0\}$ by definition of $\mathrm{B}(\lambda)$. Put $\eta_{b_{i,j}} = \eta_{\bar{b}_{i,j}} = 0$ for every $j \geq 2$, so that:

$$\psi_i(\eta, \theta) = 0 \Leftrightarrow x_{\bar{b}_{i,1}}\eta_{b_{i,1}} - \eta_{b_{i,1}} z_{\bar{b}_{i,1}} = \sum_{h\in H_i} \epsilon(h)(x_{\bar{h}}\eta_h + \eta_{\bar{h}} z_h).$$

Hence we can choose $\eta_{b_{i,1}}$ in order to satisfy the right hand side equation since:

$$\operatorname{Spec} x_{\bar{b}_{i,1}} \cap \operatorname{Spec} z_{\bar{b}_{i,1}} = \varnothing \Rightarrow (\eta_{b_{i,1}} \mapsto x_{\bar{b}_{i,1}}\eta_{b_{i,1}} - \eta_{b_{i,1}} z_{\bar{b}_{i,1}}) \text{ invertible.}$$

Thanks to 2.10, $(X, F) \in C$ satisfies:

$$\mathbb{C}[\sigma_i(X)].\Sigma_i(X, F)(\phi_i) = V^*_{\nu_i}.$$

We finally have to check the stability of (X, F) to conclude. Consider $S \subseteq \ker F$ stable by X. We have $S \cap \mathfrak{I} = \{0\}$ by stability of (x, f), thus $S \simeq S_i$ and we see S as a subspace of $\ker F \cap (\cap_{h\in H_i} \ker X_h)$. But then S^* is stable by $\sigma_i(X)$ and contains $\operatorname{Im} F^* + \sum_{h\in H_i} \operatorname{Im} X_h^*$, and thus ϕ_i. Hence $S^* = V_{\nu_i}$, and $S = \{0\}$. □

Proposition 2.17. *We have* $\mathrm{B}(\lambda) = \operatorname{Irr} \mathsf{L}(\lambda)$.

Proof. Thanks to 2.15, we have $\mathrm{B}(\lambda) \subseteq \operatorname{Irr} \mathsf{L}(\lambda)$. Consider $Z \in \operatorname{Irr} \mathsf{L}(\nu, \lambda)_{i,l} \setminus \mathrm{B}(\lambda)$ for some $l > 0$. We know (*c.f.* [Nak98, 4.6]) that if $i \in I^{\mathrm{re}}$, we necessarily have $l + \langle e_i, \nu - C\lambda\rangle \geq 0$, and thus, by definition of $\mathrm{B}(\lambda)$:

$$\mathsf{I}_\circ(\nu, \lambda)_{i,l}(Z) \in \Big(\operatorname{Irr} \mathsf{L}(\nu - le_i, \lambda) \setminus \mathrm{B}(\lambda)\Big) \times \operatorname{Irr} \Lambda(le_i).$$

If $i \in I^{\mathrm{im}}$, $Z \in \operatorname{Irr} \mathsf{L}(\nu, \lambda)_{i,l}$ necessarily implies $\lambda_i + \sum_{h\in H_i} \nu_{t(h)} > 0$, and we get to the same conclusion. By descending induction on ν, we obtain that the only irreducible component of $\mathsf{L}(0, \lambda)$ doesn't belong to $\mathrm{B}(\lambda)$, which is absurd. □

Corollary 2.18. *Take* $i \in I^{\mathrm{im}}$ *and assume* $\operatorname{Irr} \mathsf{L}(\nu, \lambda)_{i,l} \subseteq \mathrm{B}(\lambda)$. *We have the following commutative diagram:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \operatorname{Irr} \mathsf{L}(\nu, \lambda)_{i,l} & \xrightarrow[\sim]{\mathsf{I}(\nu,\lambda)_{i,l}} & \operatorname{Irr} \mathsf{L}(\nu - le_i, \lambda)_{i,0} \times \operatorname{Irr} \Lambda(le_i) \\ \sim\downarrow & & \downarrow\sim \\ \operatorname{Irr} \mathfrak{L}(\nu, \lambda)_{i,l} & \xrightarrow[\sim]{\mathsf{I}(\nu,\lambda)_{i,l}} & \operatorname{Irr} \mathfrak{L}(\nu - le_i, \lambda)_{i,0} \times \operatorname{Irr} \Lambda(le_i). \end{array} \tag{2.19}$$

Proof. By definition of stability, the action of G_ν on $\mathsf{L}(\nu, \lambda)$ is free. □

2.3. **Tensor product on** $\operatorname{Irr} \mathfrak{L}$.

2.4. **Another Lagrangian subvariety.** Embed W in a $\lambda+\lambda'$-dimensional I-graded vector space, and fix a supplementary subspace W' of W. We still denote by $I(X,Y)$ the set of I-graded isomorphisms between two I-graded spaces X and Y.

For every $\mathbf{v}\in\mathbb{N}^I$, denote by $\mathsf{Z}_\circ(\mathbf{v})\subseteq\mathsf{M}_\circ(\mathbf{v},\lambda+\lambda')$ of elements (x,f,g) such that there exists an I-graded subspace V of $V_\mathbf{v}$ satisfying:

(1) $x(V)\subseteq V$;
(2) $f(V)\subseteq W$;
(3) $g(W\oplus W')\subseteq V$;
(4) $g(W)=\{0\}$,

and denote by $V(x,f,g)$ the larger x-stable subspace of $f^{-1}(W)$ containing $\operatorname{Im} g$. We will then denote by $\widetilde{\mathsf{Z}}_\circ(\mathbf{v})\subset\mathsf{Z}_\circ(\mathbf{v})$ the subvariety of elements (x,f,g) such that:

$$(x,f)^{|V\times W}_{|V\times V}\text{ and }(x,f)^{|(V_\mathbf{v}/V)\times(W\oplus W'/W)}_{|(V_\mathbf{v}/V)\times(V_\mathbf{v}/V)}\text{ are seminilpotents}$$

where we have written V instead of $V(x,f,g)$. We get a stratification of $\widetilde{\mathsf{Z}}_\circ(\mathbf{v})$ by setting, for any ν,ν' such that $\nu+\nu'=\mathbf{v}$:

$$\widetilde{\mathsf{Z}}_\circ(\nu,\nu')=\left\{(x,f,g)\in\widetilde{\mathsf{Z}}_\circ(\nu+\nu')\mid\dim V(x,f,g)=\nu\right\}.$$

Define the following incidence variety:

$$\check{\mathsf{Z}}_\circ(\nu,\nu')=\left\{(x,f,g,V',\beta)\;\middle|\;\begin{array}{l}(x,f,g)\in\widetilde{\mathsf{Z}}_\circ(\nu,\nu')\\ V(x,f,g)\oplus V'=V_{\nu+\nu'}\\ \beta\in I(V(x,f,g),V_\nu)\times I(V',V_{\nu'})\end{array}\right\}.$$

By definition of $V(x,f,g)$ (again denoted by V hereunder), we have:

$$(x,f,g)\in\mathsf{Z}_\circ(\mathbf{v})\Rightarrow(x,f)^{|(V_\mathbf{v}/V)\times(W\oplus W'/W)}_{|(V_\mathbf{v}/V)\times(V_\mathbf{v}/V)}\text{ stable,}$$

hence the following application is well defined:

$$\mathsf{T}_\circ\left|\begin{array}{l}\check{\mathsf{Z}}_\circ(\nu,\nu')\to\mathsf{L}_\circ(\nu,\lambda)\times\mathsf{L}(\nu',\lambda')\\ (x,f,g,V',\beta)\mapsto\beta_*\left((x,f)^{|V\times W}_{|V\times V},(x,f)^{|V'\times(W\oplus W'/W)}_{|V'\times V'}\right)\end{array}\right.$$

Proposition 2.20. *The map $\mathsf{T}_\circ$ is smooth with connected fibers.*

Proof. Let (x,f) and (x',f') be elements of $\mathsf{L}_\circ(\nu,\lambda)$ and $\mathsf{L}(\nu',\lambda')$ and take I-graded spaces V and V' of dimensions ν and ν'. Define (X,F,G,V',β) in the fiber $\mathsf{T}_\circ^{-1}((x,f),(x',f'))$ by:

(1) $\beta\in I(V,V_\nu)\times I(V',V_{\nu'})$;

(2) $G=0\oplus\tau$ where:
$$\nu\in\oplus_{i\in I}\operatorname{Hom}(W'_i,V_i);$$

(3) $X=\beta^*x\oplus(\beta^*x'+\eta):V\oplus V'\to V\oplus V'$ where:
$$\eta\in\oplus_{h\in H}\operatorname{Hom}(V'_{s(h)},V_{t(h)});$$

(4) $F=\beta^*f\oplus(\beta^*f'+\theta):V\oplus V'\to W\oplus W'$ where:
$$\theta\in\oplus_{i\in I}\operatorname{Hom}(V'_i,W_i);$$

such that $\mu_{\nu+\nu',\lambda+\lambda'}(X,F,G)=0$.

Lemma 2.21. *This equation is linear in the variables (τ, η, θ), and the associated linear map is surjective.*

Proof. We first identify x, x', and f' with $\beta^* x, \beta^* x'$, and $\beta^* f'$. Then the linear map $\zeta = (\zeta_i)$ we are interested in is given by:

$$\zeta_i(\tau, \eta, \theta) = \tau_i f'_i + \sum_{h \in H : s(h) = i} \epsilon(\bar{h})(x_{\bar{h}} \eta_h + \eta_{\bar{h}} x'_h).$$

Take $L \in \oplus_{i \in I} \mathrm{Hom}(V_i, V'_i)$ such that for every (τ, η, θ):

$$\sum_{i \in I} \mathrm{Tr}(\zeta(\tau, \eta, \theta) L_i) = 0.$$

Then for every edge h such that $s(h) = i$, $t(h) = j$, we have for every η_h:

$$\mathrm{Tr}(x_{\bar{h}} \eta_h L_i) - \mathrm{Tr}(\eta_h x'_{\bar{h}} L_j) = 0.$$

But

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\eta_h L_i x_{\bar{h}}) - \mathrm{Tr}(\eta_h x'_{\bar{h}} L_j) = \mathrm{Tr}(\eta_h L_i x_{\bar{h}} - \eta_h x'_{\bar{h}} L_j) = \mathrm{Tr}(\eta_h (L_i x_{\bar{h}} - x'_{\bar{h}} L_j))$$

Hence $L_i x_{\bar{h}} = x'_{\bar{h}} L_j$, and thus $\mathrm{Im}\, L$ is stable by x'. Moreover:

$$\forall i, \forall \tau_i, \mathrm{Tr}(\tau_i f'_i L_i) = 0 \Rightarrow \forall i, f'_i L_i = 0 \Rightarrow \mathrm{Im}\, L \subset \ker f',$$

hence the lemma comes from the stability of (x', f'). □

We have to check that $V = V(X, F, G)$. It is easy to see that $V \subset V(X, F, G)$. Moreover:

$$F^{-1}(W) = \{v + v' \in V \oplus V' \mid f(v) + \theta(v') + f'(v') \in W\} = V \oplus \ker f',$$

hence, if Y is an X-stable subspace of $F^{-1}(W)$, Y/V is an x'-stable subspace of $\ker f'$. Since (x', f') is stable, we have $Y \subset V$, and thus $V = V(X, F, G)$.

We have proved that the fiber $\mathsf{T}_\circ^{-1}((x, f), (x', f'))$ is isomorphic to:

$$G_{\nu+\nu'} \times \mathbb{C}^{\langle \lambda', \nu \rangle + (\nu', \nu) + \langle \nu', \lambda \rangle - \langle \nu', \nu \rangle}$$

and thus is connected. □

Lemma 2.22. *Consider $(x, f, g) \in \widetilde{\mathsf{Z}}_\circ(\nu, \nu')$ and $V = V(x, f, g)$. Then:*

$$(x, f, g) \text{ stable } \Leftrightarrow (x, f)|^{V \times W}_{V \times V} \text{ stable}$$

and we denote by $\widetilde{\mathsf{Z}}(\nu, \nu')$ the subvariety of stable points of $\widetilde{\mathsf{Z}}_\circ(\nu, \nu')$, and:

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{Z}}(\nu, \nu') = \widetilde{\mathsf{Z}}(\nu, \nu') /\!\!/ G_{\nu+\nu'}.$$

Proof. The equivalence is a consequence of the following facts:

- the restriction of a stable point is stable;
- the extension of a stable point by a stable point is stable;
- the point $(x, f)|^{(V_{\nu+\nu'}/V) \times (W \oplus W'/W)}_{(V_{\nu+\nu'}/V) \times (V_{\nu+\nu'}/V)}$ is stable.

□

Theorem 2.23. *We have the following bijection:*

$$\mathrm{Irr}\, \mathfrak{L}(\nu, \lambda) \times \mathrm{Irr}\, \mathfrak{L}(\nu, \lambda') \xrightarrow[\sim]{\otimes} \mathrm{Irr}\, \widetilde{\mathfrak{Z}}(\nu, \nu').$$

Proof. Define $\check{\mathsf{Z}}(\nu,\nu')$ as the variety of stable points of $\check{\mathsf{Z}}_\circ(\nu,\nu')$. We have the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \check{\mathsf{Z}}(\nu,\nu') & \xrightarrow{\mathsf{T}} & \mathsf{L}(\nu,\lambda)\times\mathsf{L}(\nu',\lambda') \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \widetilde{\mathfrak{Z}}(\nu,\nu') & \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{T}} & \mathfrak{L}(\nu,\lambda)\times\mathfrak{L}(\nu',\lambda') \end{array}$$

where the rightmost vertical map is juste the free quotient by $G_\nu \times G_{\nu'}$. The leftmost map being a principal bundle with fibers isomorphic to:

$$G_\nu \times G_{\nu'} \times \mathrm{Grass}^I_{\nu,\nu'}(\nu+\nu') \times G_{\nu+\nu'},$$

we get our bijection thanks to 2.20 and 2.22. □

Again, there is an alternative definition for $\widetilde{\mathfrak{Z}}(\nu,\nu')$, given in [Nak01]. Denote by $*$ the $\mathbb{C}^*$-action on $\mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{v},\lambda+\lambda')$ induced by the one parameter subgroup $\mathbb{C}^* \to GL(W\oplus W')$, $t \mapsto t\,\mathrm{id}_W \oplus \mathrm{id}_{W'}$. We have:

$$\mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{v},\lambda+\lambda')^{\mathbb{C}^*} \simeq \bigsqcup_{\nu+\nu'=\mathbf{v}} \mathfrak{M}(\nu,\lambda)\times\mathfrak{M}(\nu',\lambda')$$

and:

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{Z}}(\nu,\nu') = \{[x,f,g]\in\mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{v},\lambda+\lambda') \mid \lim_{t\to 0} t*[x,f,g]\in\mathfrak{L}(\nu,\lambda)\times\mathfrak{L}(\nu',\lambda')\}.$$

Hence we also have, as in [Nak01, 3.15], the following:

Proposition 2.24. *The subvariety $\widetilde{\mathfrak{Z}}(\nu,\nu')\subset\mathfrak{M}(\nu+\nu',\lambda+\lambda')$ is Lagrangian.*

The results of the section 2.2 lead to the following, completing [Nak01, 4.3] which deals with the case $\omega_i = 0$:

Proposition 2.25. *Consider i such that $\omega_i > 0$ and $l > 0$. If:*

$$\lambda_i + \lambda'_i + \sum_{h\in H_i} \mathbf{v}_{t(h)} > 0,$$

we have a bijection:

$$\mathrm{Irr}\,\widetilde{\mathfrak{Z}}(\mathbf{v})_{i,l} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Irr}\,\widetilde{\mathfrak{Z}}(\mathbf{v}-le_i)_{i,0}\times\mathrm{Irr}\,\Lambda(le_i).$$

2.5. **Comparison of two crystal-type structures.**

Notations 2.26. For every $X\in\mathrm{Irr}\,\widetilde{\mathfrak{Z}}(\mathbf{v})_{i,l}$, we will denote by $\epsilon_i(X)\in\mathrm{Irr}\,\Lambda(le_i)$ the composition of the second projection with the bijection obtained in 2.25, and $|\epsilon_i(X)| = l$. Note that if $(X,X')\in\mathrm{Irr}\,\mathfrak{L}(\nu,\lambda)\times\mathrm{Irr}\,\mathfrak{L}(\nu',\lambda')$, the quantity $\epsilon_i(X\otimes X')$ makes sense thanks to 2.23 and 2.25.

We will write $\Omega(i) = \{b_{i,j}\}_{1\le j\le\omega_i}$ for i imaginary, or $\Omega(i) = \{b_j\}_{1\le j\le\omega_i}$ if it is not ambiguous.

Lemma 2.27. *Let i be an imaginary vertex and assume $\sum_{h\in H_i} n_{t(h)} > 0$. For every $C\in\mathrm{Irr}\,\mathfrak{L}(\nu,\lambda)$, there exists $(x,f)\in C$, $v\in\mathrm{Im}\sum_{h\in H_i} x_{\bar{h}}$ such that:*

$$\mathbb{C}[x_{\bar{b}_1}].v = \mathfrak{I}_i(x,f).$$

Proof. We proceed by induction on ν_i, the first step being trivial. For the inductive step, we can immediatly conclude if $C \in \operatorname{Irr} \mathfrak{L}(\nu,\lambda)_{i,l}$ for $l > 0$. Otherwise, $C \in \operatorname{Irr} \mathfrak{L}(\nu,\lambda)_{i,0}$, but $C \in \operatorname{Irr} \mathfrak{L}(\nu,\lambda)_{j,l}$ for some $j \in I$ and $l > 0$. There exists a minimal chain $(j_k, l_k, C_k)_{1\leq k\leq s}$ of elements of $I \times \mathbb{N}_{>0} \times \operatorname{Irr} \mathfrak{L}(-,\lambda)$ such that:

- $(j_1, l_1, C_1) = (j, l, C)$;
- $C_{k+1} = \operatorname{pr}_1 \mathfrak{l}(\nu - l_1 j_1 - \cdots - l_k j_k, \lambda)_{j_k,l_k}(C_k)$ where pr_1 is the first projection;
- $j_s = i$.

We necessarely have j_{s-1} adjacent to i, and by the induction hypothesis, the proposition is satisfied by C_s, and thus by C_{s-1}. But then, thanks to 2.10 and 2.12, the proposition is also satisfied by C_{s-2} for a generic choice of $\eta_{\bar{h}}$ (using the notations of the proof of 2.15 where i is replaced by j_{s-1}). Hence it is also satisfied by $C = C_1$. □

Proposition 2.28. *Let i be an imaginary vertex and consider $(X, X') \in \operatorname{Irr} \mathfrak{L}(\nu,\lambda) \times \operatorname{Irr} \mathfrak{L}(\nu',\lambda')$. Assume $|\epsilon_i(X')| < \nu'_i$ or $0 < \lambda'_i$. Then we have:*

$$\epsilon_i(X \otimes X') = \epsilon_i(X').$$

Proof. Put $(Y, C) = \mathfrak{l}(n,m)_{i,l}(X)$ where $l = |\epsilon_i(X)|$. Take $((x,f),(x',f')) \in X \times X'$. Consider the equation $\zeta_i = 0$ used in the proof of 2.21:

$$\tau_i f'_i + \sum_{h\in H : s(h)=i} \epsilon(\bar{h})(x_{\bar{h}}\eta_h + \eta_{\bar{h}} x'_h) = 0.$$

Note $\eta_{b_j} = \eta_j$, $x_{b_j} = x_j$ and $x_{\bar{b}_j} = \bar{x}_j$ (and the same with x'), take $\eta_{\bar{b}_j} = 0$ so that our equation becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_i f'_i + \sum_{h\in H_i} \eta_{\bar{h}} x'_h &= \sum_{1\leq j\leq \omega_i} (\bar{x}_j \eta_j - \eta_j \bar{x}'_j) \\ &= \bar{x}_1\eta_1 - \eta_1 \bar{x}'_1\end{aligned}$$

if we also set $\eta_j = 0$ for $j \geq 2$ (if any). Then, we set:

$$\begin{aligned} x' &= f'_i + \bigoplus_{h\in H_i} x'_h : V_{\nu'_i} \to W'_i \oplus \bigoplus_{h\in H_i} V_{\nu'_{t(h)}} \\ \bar{\eta} &= \tau_i + \sum_{h\in H_i} \epsilon(\bar{h})\eta_{\bar{h}} : W'_i \oplus \bigoplus_{h\in H_i} V_{\nu'_{t(h)}} \to V_{\nu_i} \\ \bar{x} &= \sum_{h\in H_i} \epsilon(\bar{h}) x_{\bar{h}} : \bigoplus_{h\in H_i} V_{\nu_{t(h)}} \to V_{\nu_i} \\ \eta &= \bigoplus_{h\in H_i} \eta_h : V_{\nu'_i} \to \bigoplus_{h\in H_i} V_{\nu_{t(h)}} \end{aligned}$$

and our equation finally becomes:

$$\bar{\eta} x' + \eta \bar{x} = \bar{x}_1\eta_1 - \eta_1 \bar{x}'_1.$$

Consider the open subvariety of $X \times X'$ where:

(1) there exists $\mathbf{v} \in V_{\nu_i}$ such that its image $\bar{\mathbf{v}} \in V_{\nu_i}/\mathfrak{I}_i(x,f)$ satisfies:
$$\mathbb{C}[\bar{x}_{1|V_{\nu_i}/\mathfrak{I}_i(x,f)}].\bar{\mathbf{v}} = V_{\nu_i}/\mathfrak{I}_i(x,f);$$

(2) $\bar{x}'_1$, $\bar{x}_{1|\mathfrak{I}_i(x,f)}$ and $\bar{x}_{1|\mathbb{C}^{n_i}/\mathfrak{I}_i(x,f)}$ have disjoint spectra;

(3) there exist v and v' such that $\mathbf{w} = \sum_{h\in H_i} x_{\bar{h}}(v)$ and $\mathbf{w}' = \sum_{h\in H_i} x'_{\bar{h}}(v')$ satisfy:

$$\mathbb{C}[\bar{x}_1 \oplus \bar{x}'_1].\mathbf{w} \oplus \mathbf{w}' = \mathfrak{I}_i(x, f) \oplus \mathfrak{I}_i(x', f');$$

which is nonempty, thanks to 2.12, 2.27 and 2.10. Take:

- $\bar{\eta} = \tau_i$ and $\mathbf{v} \in \operatorname{Im} \tau_i$ if $\lambda'_i > 0$;
- $\bar{\eta}$ such that $\bar{\eta}(v') = \mathbf{v}$ if $\nu'_i > |\epsilon_i(X')|$ (possible since $v' \neq 0$).

From 2.10, we get (with the notations used in the proof of 2.20):

$$\mathbb{C}[X_{\bar{b}_1}].\operatorname{Im}\Big(\sum_{h\in H_i} X_{\bar{h}}\Big) = V_{\nu_i} \oplus \mathfrak{I}_i(x', f').$$

We have to check that we can choose η such that the equations $\zeta_{t(h)} = 0$ are satisfied for every $h \in H_i$ (if $\lambda'_i > 0$ and $\bar{\eta} = \tau_i$, just take $\eta = 0$). It suffices to set $\eta_h x'_{\bar{h}}(v'_{t(h)}) = -x_h \eta_{\bar{h}}(v'_{t(h)})$ (possible since $\nu'_i > |\epsilon_i(X')|$ and since we may assume that $v'_{t(h)} = 0$ if $x'_{\bar{h}}(v'_{t(h)}) = 0$) and to set η and $\bar{\eta}$ equal to zero on supplementaries of $\mathbb{C}\mathbf{w}'$ and $\mathbb{C}v'$ respectively. We can finally choose η_1 such that $\bar{\eta}x' + \eta\bar{x} = \bar{x}_1\eta_1 - \eta_1\bar{x}'_1$ (possible since $\operatorname{Spec}\bar{x}'_1 \cap \operatorname{Spec}\bar{x}_1 = \varnothing$). Since:

$$\operatorname{codim}\mathfrak{I}_i(x, f) \geq |\epsilon_i(X')|,$$

for every $(x, f) \in X \otimes X'$, the subvariety of $X \otimes X'$ defined by:

$$\operatorname{codim}\mathfrak{I}_i(x, f) = |\epsilon_i(X')|,$$

is open, and we have shown it is non empty, hence the theorem is proved. □

Proposition 2.29. *Assume $\lambda'_i = 0$, $|\epsilon_i(X')| = \nu'_i$ and $\sum_{h\in H_i} \nu'_{t(h)} > 0$. Then we still have $\epsilon_i(X \otimes X') = \epsilon_i(X')$.*

Proof. Thanks to the previous proof, the result is clear if there exists an imaginary vertex j adjacent to i: the choice of $x_{\bar{b}_{j,1}}$ and $x'_{\bar{b}_{j,1}}$ with disjoint spectra enables to use $\eta_{b_{j,1}}$ for $\zeta_j = 0$ to be satisfied (with the usual notation $\Omega(j) = \{b_{j,1}, \ldots, b_{j,\omega_j}\}$).

Assume that every neighbour of i is real. Following the previous proof, assume $\bar{\eta} = \eta_{\bar{h}}$ is of rank 1 for some $h : i \to j$. We have to check that $\zeta_j = 0$ can be satisfied. It is clear if $f'_j \neq 0$: just choose τ_j such that $\tau_j f'_j = -\epsilon(h)x_h\eta_{\bar{h}}$ and $\eta_p = 0 = \eta_{\bar{p}}$ if $p \in H_j \setminus \{\bar{h}\}$, so that $\zeta_j = 0$ is satisfied. Otherwise, there necessarily exists an edge $q : j \to k \neq i$ such that $x'_q \neq 0$ (if not, $V'_{\nu'_i} \oplus V'_{\nu'_j} \subseteq \ker f'$ would be x'-stable, which is not possible for every vertex j adjacent to i since $\sum_{h\in H_i} \nu'_{t(h)} > 0$). Hence it is possible to choose $\eta_{\bar{q}}$ so that $\epsilon(\bar{q})\eta_{\bar{q}}x'_q = -\epsilon(h)x_h\eta_{\bar{h}}$ and $\eta_p = 0 = \eta_{\bar{p}}$ if $p \in H_j \setminus \{\bar{h}, q\}$, and thus get $\zeta_j = 0$ satisfied. □

We have proved the following:

Theorem 2.30. *Let i be an imaginary vertex and consider $(X, X') \in \operatorname{Irr}\mathfrak{L}(\nu, \lambda) \times \operatorname{Irr}\mathfrak{L}(\nu', \lambda')$. We have:*

$$\epsilon_i(X \otimes X') = \begin{cases} \epsilon_i(X') & \text{if } \lambda'_i + \displaystyle\sum_{h\in H_i} \nu'_{t(h)} > 0 \\ \epsilon_i(X) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

3. Generalized crystals

Let $(-,-)$ denote the symmetric Euler form on $\mathbb{Z}I$: (i,j) is equal to the opposite of the number of edges of Ω between i and j for $i \neq j \in I$, and $(i,i) = 2-2\omega_i$. We will still denote by I^{re} (resp. I^{im}) the set of real (resp. imaginary) vertices, and by $I^{\mathrm{iso}} \subseteq I^{\mathrm{im}}$ the set of *isotropic* vertices: vertices i such that $(i,i) = 0$, *i.e.* such that $\omega_i = 1$. We also set $I_\infty = (I^{\mathrm{re}} \times \{1\}) \cup (I^{\mathrm{im}} \times \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1})$, and $(\iota, j) = l(i,j)$ if $\iota = (i,l) \in I_\infty$ and $j \in I$.

3.1. **A generalized quantum group.** We recall some of the definitions and results exposed in [Boz13, §2].

Definition 3.1. Let F denote the $\mathbb{Q}(v)$-algebra generated by $(E_\iota)_{\iota \in I_\infty}$, naturally $\mathbb{N}I$-graded by $\deg(E_{i,l}) = li$ for $(i,l) \in I_\infty$. We put $\mathsf{F}[A] = \{x \in \mathsf{F} \mid |x| \in A\}$ for any $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}I$, where we denote by $|x|$ the degree of an element x.

For $\nu = \sum \nu_i i \in \mathbb{Z}I$, we set:

- ht$(\nu) = \sum \nu_i$ its height;
- $v_\nu = \prod v_i^{\nu_i}$ if $v_i = v^{(i,i)/2}$.

We endow $\mathsf{F} \otimes \mathsf{F}$ with the following multiplication:

$$(a \otimes b)(c \otimes d) = v^{(|b|,|c|)}(ac) \otimes (bd).$$

and equip F with a comultiplication δ defined by:

$$\delta(E_{i,l}) = \sum_{t+t'=l} v_i^{tt'} E_{i,t} \otimes E_{i,t'}$$

where $(i,l) \in I_\infty$ and $E_{i,0} = 1$.

Proposition 3.2. *For any family $(\nu_\iota)_{\iota \in I_\infty}$, we can endow F with a bilinear form $\{-,-\}$ such that:*

- $\{x,y\} = 0$ *if* $|x| \neq |y|$*;*
- $\{E_\iota, E_\iota\} = \nu_\iota$ *for all* $\iota \in I_\infty$*;*
- $\{ab, c\} = \{a \otimes b, \delta(c)\}$ *for all* $a, b, c \in \mathsf{F}$.

Notations 3.3. Take $i \in I^{\mathrm{im}}$ and c a composition or a partition. We put $E_{i,\mathsf{c}} = \prod_j E_{i,\mathsf{c}_j}$ and $\nu_{i,\mathsf{c}} = \prod_j \nu_{i,\mathsf{c}_j}$. If i is real, we will often use the index i instead of $i,1$.

Proposition 3.4. *Consider $(\iota, j) \in I_\infty \times I^{re}$. The element:*

$$\sum_{t+t'=-(\iota,j)+1} (-1)^t E_j^{(t)} E_\iota E_j^{(t')} \tag{3.5}$$

belongs to the radical of $\{-,-\}$.

Definition 3.6. We denote by $\tilde{U}^+$ the quotient of F by the ideal spanned by the elements 3.5 and the commutators $[E_{i,l}, E_{i,k}]$ for every isotropic vertex i, so that $\{-,-\}$ is still defined on $\tilde{U}^+$. We denote by U^+ the quotient of $\tilde{U}^+$ by the radical of $\{-,-\}$.

Definition 3.7. Let $\hat{U}$ be the quotient of the algebra generated by $K_i^{\pm}$, E_ι, F_ι ($i \in I$ and $\iota \in I_\infty$) subject to the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned}
K_iK_j &= K_jK_i \\
K_iK_i^- &= 1 \\
K_jE_\iota &= v^{(j,\iota)}E_\iota K_j \\
K_jF_\iota &= v^{-(j,\iota)}F_\iota K_j \\
\sum_{t+t'=-(\iota,j)+1} (-1)^t E_j^{(t)} E_\iota E_j^{(t')} &= 0 \qquad (j \in I^{\mathrm{re}}) \\
\sum_{t+t'=-(\iota,j)+1} (-1)^t F_j^{(t)} F_\iota F_j^{(t')} &= 0 \qquad (j \in I^{\mathrm{re}}) \\
[E_{i,l}, E_{j,k}] &= 0 \qquad \text{if } (i,j) = 0 \\
[F_{i,l}, F_{j,k}] &= 0 \qquad \text{if } (i,j) = 0 \\
[E_{i,l}, E_{i,k}] &= 0 \qquad (i \in I^{\mathrm{iso}}) \\
[F_{i,l}, F_{i,k}] &= 0 \qquad (i \in I^{\mathrm{iso}}).
\end{aligned}$$

We extend the graduation by $|K_i| = 0$ and $|F_\iota| = -|E_\iota|$, and we set $K_\nu = \prod_i K_i^{\nu_i}$ for every $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}I$.

We endow $\hat{U}$ with a comultiplication Δ defined by:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta(K_i) &= K_i \otimes K_i \\
\Delta(E_{i,l}) &= \sum_{t+t'=l} v_i^{tt'} E_{i,t} K_{t'i} \otimes E_{i,t'} \\
\Delta(F_{i,l}) &= \sum_{t+t'=l} v_i^{-tt'} F_{i,t} \otimes K_{-ti} F_{i,t'}.
\end{aligned}$$

We extend $\{-,-\}$ to the subalgebra $\hat{U}^{\geq 0} \subseteq \hat{U}$ spanned by $(K_i^{\pm})_{i\in I}$ and $(E_\iota)_{\iota \in I_\infty}$ by setting $\{xK_i, yK_j\} = \{x,y\}v^{(i,j)}$ for $x, y \in \tilde{U}^+$.

We use the Drinfeld double process to define $\tilde{U}$ as the quotient of $\hat{U}$ by the relations:

$$\sum \{a_{(1)}, b_{(2)}\}\omega(b_{(1)})a_{(2)} = \sum \{a_{(2)}, b_{(1)}\}a_{(1)}\omega(b_{(2)}) \tag{3.8}$$

for any $a, b \in \tilde{U}^{\geq 0}$, where ω is the unique involutive automorphism of $\hat{U}$ mapping E_ι to F_ι and K_i to K_{-i}, and where we use the Sweedler notation, for example $\Delta(a) = \sum a_{(1)} \otimes a_{(2)}$.

Setting $x^- = \omega(x)$ for $x \in \tilde{U}$, we define $\{-,-\}$ on the subalgebra $\tilde{U}^- \subseteq \tilde{U}$ spanned by $(F_\iota)_{\iota \in I_\infty}$ by setting $\{x,y\} = \{x^-, y^-\}$ for any $x, y \in \tilde{U}^-$. We will denote by U^- (resp. U) the quotient of $\tilde{U}^-$ (resp. $\tilde{U}$) by the radical of $\{-,-\}$ restricted to $\tilde{U}^-$(resp. restricted to $\tilde{U}^- \times \tilde{U}^+$).

Proposition 3.9. *Assume:*

$$\{E_\iota, E_\iota\} \in 1 + v^{-1}\mathbb{N}[\![v^{-1}]\!].$$

for every $\iota \in I_\infty$. Then we have $\tilde{U}^- \simeq U^-$.

Notations 3.10. We denote by $\mathcal{C}_{i,l}$ the set of compositions c (resp. partitions) such that $|\mathsf{c}| = l$ if $(i,i) < 0$ (resp. $(i,i) = 0$), and $\mathcal{C}_i = \sqcup_{l \geq 0} \mathcal{C}_{i,l}$. If i is real, we just put $\mathcal{C}_{i,l} = \{l\}$.

Denote by $u \mapsto \bar{u}$ the involutive $\mathbb{Q}$-morphism of U stabilizing E_ι, F_ι, and mappinf K_i to K_{-i}, and v to v^{-1}.

Proposition 3.11. *For any imaginary vertex i and any $l \geq 1$, there exists a unique element $a_{i,l} \in U^+[li]$ such that, if we set $b_{i,l} = a_{i,l}^-$, we get:*

1. $\mathbb{Q}(v)\langle E_{i,l} \mid l \geq 1\rangle = \mathbb{Q}(v)\langle a_{i,l} \mid l \geq 1\rangle$ *and* $\mathbb{Q}(v)\langle F_{i,l} \mid l \geq 1\rangle = \mathbb{Q}(v)\langle b_{i,l} \mid l \geq 1\rangle$ *as algebras;*
2. $\{a_{i,l}, z\} = \{b_{i,l}, z^-\} = 0$ *for any* $z \in \mathbb{Q}(v)\langle E_{i,k} \mid k < l\rangle$*;*
3. $a_{i,l} - E_{i,l} \in \mathbb{Q}(v)\langle E_{i,k} \mid k < l\rangle$ *and* $b_{i,l} - F_{i,l} \in \mathbb{Q}(v)\langle F_{i,k} \mid k < l\rangle$*;*
4. $\bar{a}_{i,l} = a_{i,l}$ *and* $\bar{b}_{i,l} = b_{i,l}$*;*
5. $\delta(a_{i,l}) = a_{i,l} \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes a_{i,l}$ *and* $\delta(b_{i,l}) = b_{i,l} \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes b_{i,l}$*;*

Notations 3.12. Consider $i \in I^{\mathrm{im}}$ and $\mathsf{c} \in \mathcal{C}_{i,l}$. We set $\tau_{i,l} = \{a_{i,l}, a_{i,l}\}$, $a_{i,\mathsf{c}} = \prod_j a_{i,\mathsf{c}_j}$, and $\tau_{i,\mathsf{c}} = \prod_j \tau_{i,\mathsf{c}_j}$. Notice that $\{a_{i,\mathsf{c}} \mid \mathsf{c} \in \mathcal{C}_{i,l}\}$ is a basis of $U^+[li]$.

Definition 3.13. We denote by $\delta_{i,\mathsf{c}}, \delta^{i,\mathsf{c}} : U^+ \to U^+$ the linear maps defined by:

$$\delta(x) = \sum_{\mathsf{c} \in \mathcal{C}_{i,l}} \delta_{i,\mathsf{c}}(x) \otimes a_{i,\mathsf{c}} + \text{obd}$$

$$\delta(x) = \sum_{\mathsf{c} \in \mathcal{C}_{i,l}} a_{i,\mathsf{c}} \otimes \delta^{i,\mathsf{c}}(x) + \text{obd}$$

where "obd" stands for terms of bidegree not in $\mathbb{N}I \times \mathbb{N}i$ in the former equality, $\mathbb{N}i \times \mathbb{N}I$ in the latter one.

3.2. **Kashiwara operators.**

Proposition 3.14. *Let i be an imaginary vertex, $l > 0$, $\mathsf{c} = (\mathsf{c}_1, \dots, \mathsf{c}_r) \in \mathcal{C}_i$ and $(y,z) \in (U^+)^2$. We have the following identities:*

1. $\delta^{i,l}(yz) = \delta^{i,l}(y)z + v^{l(i,|y|)} y \delta^{i,l}(z)$*;*
2. $[a_{i,l}, z^-] = \tau_{i,l}\big\{\delta_{i,l}(z^-)^- K_{-li} - K_{li}\delta^{i,l}(z^-)^-\big\}$*;*
3. $\delta^{i,l}(a_{i,\mathsf{c}}) = \sum_{k:\mathsf{c}_k = l} v_i^{2l\mathsf{c}_{k-1}} a_{i,\mathsf{c}\backslash\mathsf{c}_k}$

where $\mathsf{c}_0 = 0$ and $\mathsf{c}\backslash\mathsf{c}_k = (\mathsf{c}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathsf{c}}_k, \dots, \mathsf{c}_r)$, the notation $\hat{\mathsf{c}}_k$ meaning that c_k is removed from c.

Proof. The first equality comes from the definition of $\delta^{i,l}$, the second from the primitive character of $a_{i,l}$ and the formula 3.8 with $a = a_{i,l}$ and $b = z^-$. The third comes from the definition of $\delta_{i,l}$ and the primitive character of the $a_{i,h}$. □

Definition 3.15. Define $e'_{i,l} : U^- \to U^-$ by $e'_{i,l}(z^-) = \delta^{i,l}(z)^-$ for any $z \in U^+$.

Proposition 3.16. *Set*

$$\mathcal{K}_i = \bigcap_{l>0} \ker e'_{i,l}$$

for any $i \in I^{\mathrm{im}}$. We have the following decomposition:

$$U^- = \bigoplus_{\mathsf{c} \in \mathcal{C}_i} b_{i,\mathsf{c}} \mathcal{K}_i.$$

Proof. Let's first prove the existence. Consider $u \in U^-$, and assume first that u is of the following form: $u = mb_{i,\mathsf{c}}m'$ for some $\mathsf{c} \in \mathcal{C}_i$ and some $m, m' \in \mathcal{K}_i$. We proceed by induction on $|\mathsf{c}|$. If $|\mathsf{c}| = 0$, we have $mm' \in \mathcal{K}_i$ thanks to 3.14 (1). Otherwise, set $[y,z]^\circ = v^{-(|y|,|z|)}yz - zy$ for any $y, z \in U^+$. Thanks to 3.14 (1), and since $\delta^{i,l}(a_{i,k}) = \delta_{l,k}$, we have for any $y \in \cap_{l>0} \ker \delta^{i,l}$ and any $k > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}\delta^{i,l}([y, a_{i,k}]^\circ) &= v^{-k(i,|y|)}\delta^{i,l}(ya_{i,k}) - \delta^{i,l}(a_{i,k}y)\\ &= v^{-k(i,|y|)}v^{l(i,|y|)}y\delta^{i,l}(a_{i,k}) - \delta^{i,l}(a_{i,k})y\\ &= \delta_{l,k}v^{(l-k)(i,|y|)}y - \delta_{l,k}y\\ &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the following equality:

$$u = v^{\mathsf{c}_1(|m|,i)}[m, b_{i,\mathsf{c}_1}]^\circ b_{i,\mathsf{c}\setminus\mathsf{c}_1}m' + v^{-\mathsf{c}_1(|m|,i)}b_{i,\mathsf{c}_1}mb_{i,\mathsf{c}\setminus\mathsf{c}_1}m'$$

along with the induction hypothesis allow us to conclude since $|\mathsf{c}\setminus\mathsf{c}_1| < |\mathsf{c}|$, and since $\oplus_{\mathsf{c}\in\mathcal{C}_i} b_{i,\mathsf{c}}\mathcal{K}_i$ is stable by left-multiplication by b_{i,c_1}.

Then, we prove the existence of the decompostion for a general $u \in U^-$, using induction on $-|u|$. If $u \neq 1$, we can write:

$$u = \sum_{\iota\in I_\infty} b_\iota u_\iota$$

for some finitely many nonzero $u_\iota \in U^-$. Thanks to our induction hypothesis, we have:

$$u = \sum_{\iota\in I_\infty, \mathsf{c}\in\mathcal{C}_i} b_\iota b_{i,\mathsf{c}} z_{\iota,\mathsf{c}}$$

for some finitely many nonzero $z_{\iota,\mathsf{c}} \in \mathcal{K}_i$. Then:

$$u = \sum_{l>0,\mathsf{c}\in\mathcal{C}_i} b_{i,(l,\mathsf{c})}z_{(i,l),\mathsf{c}} + \sum_{\substack{\iota\in I_\infty\setminus(\{i\}\times\mathbb{N}_{>0})\\ \mathsf{c}\in\mathcal{C}_i}} b_\iota b_{i,\mathsf{c}}z_{\iota,\mathsf{c}}$$

and we have the result since $b_\iota b_{i,\mathsf{c}}z_{\iota,\mathsf{c}}$ is of the form $mb_{i,\mathsf{c}}m'$ for some $m, m' \in \mathcal{K}_i$. Indeed, it is straightforward from the definitions that $\delta^{i,l}(a_{j,h}) = 0$ for any $l, h > 0$ if $j \neq i$. Note that if $i \notin I^{\text{iso}}$, the composition (l, c) is the composition c' where $\mathsf{c}'_1 = l$ and $\mathsf{c}'_k = \mathsf{c}_{k-1}$ if $k \geq 2$, but if $i \in I^{\text{iso}}$, (l, c) stands for the partition $\mathsf{c} \cup l$.

To prove the unicity of the decomposition, consider a minimal nontrivial relation of dependance:

$$0 = \sum_{\mathsf{c}\in\mathcal{C}_i} a_{i,\mathsf{c}}z_{\mathsf{c}},$$

where $z_{\mathsf{c}} \in \mathcal{K}_i^-$. We have to considerate separately the cases $i \in I^{\text{iso}}$ and $i \notin I^{\text{iso}}$. First, consider $i \notin I^{\text{iso}}$. Consider r maximal such that there exists $\mathsf{c} = (\mathsf{c}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{c}_r)$ such that $z_{\mathsf{c}} \neq 0$. Using 3.14 (1) and applying repeatedly 3.14 (3), we see that for

any $\mathsf{c}' \in \mathfrak{S}_r\mathsf{c}$ (with the convention $(\sigma\mathsf{c})_k = \mathsf{c}_{\sigma(k)}$):

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \delta^{i,\mathsf{c}'}\Big(\sum_{\mathsf{c}''\in\mathcal{C}_i} a_{i,\mathsf{c}''} z_{\mathsf{c}''}\Big) \\ &= \sum_{\mathsf{c}''\in\mathcal{C}_i} \delta^{i,\mathsf{c}'}(a_{i,\mathsf{c}''}) z_{\mathsf{c}''} \\ &= \sum_{\mathsf{c}''\in\mathfrak{S}_r\mathsf{c}} \delta^{i,\mathsf{c}'}(a_{i,\mathsf{c}''}) z_{\mathsf{c}''} \\ &= \sum_{\mathsf{c}''\in\mathfrak{S}_r\mathsf{c}} P_{\mathsf{c}',\mathsf{c}''}(v_i) z_{\mathsf{c}''} \end{aligned}$$

where $P_{\mathsf{c}',\mathsf{c}''}(v) \in \mathbb{Z}[v]$. The third is equality is true by maximality of r. Since $(z_{\mathsf{c}''})_{\mathsf{c}''\in\mathfrak{S}_r\mathsf{c}} \neq 0$, we have to prove that:

$$\Delta(v) = \det(P_{\mathsf{c}',\mathsf{c}''}(v))_{\mathsf{c}',\mathsf{c}''\in\mathfrak{S}_r\mathsf{c}} \neq 0 \in \mathbb{Z}[v]$$

to end our proof in the case $(i,i) < 0$ (since then we have $v_i \neq 1$). But, for any $\mathsf{c}' \in \mathfrak{S}_r\mathsf{c}$, one has, using 3.14 (3):

$$\max_{\mathsf{c}''\in\mathfrak{S}_r\mathsf{c}} \{\deg(P_{\mathsf{c}',\mathsf{c}''})\} = \deg(P_{\mathsf{c}',\mathsf{c}'}) = \sum_{1\leq k\leq r} \mathsf{c}_{k-1}\mathsf{c}_k = m$$

which is only reached for $\mathsf{c}'' = \mathsf{c}'$. Note that if $m = 0$, the initial relation of dependance can be written:

$$0 = \sum_{l>0} a_{i,l} z_l,$$

and we get $z_l = 0$ after applying $\delta^{i,l}$. Otherwise, note that the degree of Δ is $|\mathfrak{S}_r\mathsf{c}|m > 0$, and in particular $\Delta \neq 0$.

We finally have to prove the uniqueness in the case $(i,i) = 0$. Write a relation of dependance of minimal degree:

$$0 = \sum_{\lambda\in\mathcal{C}_i} a_{i,\lambda} z_\lambda,$$

where $z_\lambda \in \mathcal{K}_i^-$. For any λ and $l > 0$, set $m_l(\lambda) = |\{s : \lambda_s = l\}|$, and denote by $\lambda\backslash l$ the partition obtained removing one of the $\lambda_s = l$ when $m_l(\lambda) \geq 1$. Hence $m_l(\lambda\backslash l) = m_l(\lambda) - 1$. We have, thanks to 3.14 (1,3):

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^{i,l}\Big(\sum_{\lambda\in\mathcal{C}_i} a_{i,\lambda} z_\lambda\Big) &= \sum_{\lambda\in\mathcal{C}_i} m_l(\lambda) a_{i,\lambda\backslash l} z_\lambda \\ &= \sum_{\mu\in\mathcal{C}_i} a_{i,\mu}\big\{(m_l(\mu)+1) z_{\mu\cup l}\big\} \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts the minimality of the first relation. Note that the proof is easier in this case because we are dealing with partitions, hence the quantity $\mu \cup l$ is "uniquely defined". □

The following definition generalizes the Kashiwara operators (see *e.g.* [KS97, 2.3.1]):

Definition 3.17. If i is imaginary and $z = \sum_{\mathsf{c}\in\mathcal{C}_i} b_{i,\mathsf{c}} z_{\mathsf{c}} \in U^-$, set:

$$\tilde{e}_{i,l}(z) = \begin{cases} \displaystyle\sum_{\mathsf{c}:\mathsf{c}_1=l} b_{i,\mathsf{c}\setminus\mathsf{c}_1} z_{\mathsf{c}} & \text{if } i \notin I^{\text{iso}} \\ \displaystyle\sum_{\lambda\in\mathcal{C}_i} \sqrt{\frac{m_l(\lambda)}{l}} b_{i,\lambda\setminus l} z_\lambda & \text{if } i \in I^{\text{iso}} \end{cases}$$

$$\tilde{f}_{i,l}(z) = \begin{cases} \displaystyle\sum_{\mathsf{c}\in\mathcal{C}_i} b_{i,(l,\mathsf{c})} z_{\mathsf{c}} & \text{if } i \notin I^{\text{iso}} \\ \displaystyle\sum_{\lambda\in\mathcal{C}_i} \sqrt{\frac{l}{m_l(\lambda)+1}} b_{i,\lambda\cup l} z_\lambda & \text{if } i \in I^{\text{iso}}. \end{cases}$$

3.3. **Definition of generalized crystals.** Denote by P the lattice $\mathbb{Z}^I$, still endowed with the pairing $\langle -,-\rangle$ defined by $\langle e_i, e_j\rangle = \delta_{i,j}$, where $e_i = (\delta_{i,j})_{j\in I}$ for every $i \in I$. We will also note α_i instead of Ce_i where $C = ((i,j))_{i,j\in I}$ still denotes the Cartan matrix associated to Q.

Definition 3.18. We call Q-crystal a set $\mathcal{B}$ together with maps:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{wt} &: \mathcal{B} \to P \\ \epsilon_i &: \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{C}_i \sqcup \{-\infty\} \\ \phi_i &: \mathcal{B} \to \mathbb{N} \sqcup \{+\infty\} \\ \tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i &: \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{B} \sqcup \{0\} && i \in I^{\text{re}} \\ \tilde{e}_{i,l}, \tilde{f}_{i,l} &: \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{B} \sqcup \{0\} && i \in I^{\text{im}}, l > 0 \end{aligned}$$

such that for every $b, b' \in \mathcal{B}$:

(A1) $\langle e_i, \text{wt}(b)\rangle \geq 0$ if $i \in I^{\text{im}}$;

(A2) $\text{wt}(\tilde{e}_{i,l} b) = \text{wt}(b) + l\alpha_i$ if $\tilde{e}_{i,l} b \neq 0$;

(A3) $\text{wt}(\tilde{f}_{i,l} b) = \text{wt}(b) - l\alpha_i$ if $\tilde{f}_{i,l} b \neq 0$;

(A4) $\tilde{f}_{i,l} b = b' \Leftrightarrow b = \tilde{e}_{i,l} b'$;

(A5) if $\tilde{e}_{i,l} b \neq 0$, $\epsilon_i(\tilde{e}_{i,l} b) = \begin{cases} \epsilon_i(b) - l & \text{if } i \in I^{\text{re}} \\ \epsilon_i(b) \setminus l & \text{if } i \in I^{\text{im}} \setminus I^{\text{iso}} \text{ and } l = \epsilon_i(b)_1 \\ \epsilon_i(b) \setminus l & \text{if } i \in I^{\text{iso}}; \end{cases}$

(A6) if $\tilde{f}_{i,l} b \neq 0$, $\epsilon_i(\tilde{f}_{i,l} b) = \begin{cases} \epsilon_i(b) + l & \text{if } i \in I^{\text{re}} \\ (l, \epsilon_i(b)) & \text{if } i \in I^{\text{im}}; \end{cases}$

(A7) $\phi_i(b) = \begin{cases} \epsilon_i(b) + \langle e_i, \text{wt}(b)\rangle & \text{if } i \in I^{\text{re}} \\ +\infty & \text{if } i \in I^{\text{im}} \text{ and } \langle e_i, \text{wt}(b)\rangle > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$

where, for $i \in I^{\text{re}}$, we write $\tilde{e}_{i,1}, \tilde{f}_{i,1}$ instead of $\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i$ and $\tilde{e}_{i,l}, \tilde{f}_{i,l}$ instead of $\tilde{e}_{i,1}^l, \tilde{f}_{i,1}^l$. Also, as earlier, $(l, \epsilon_i(b))$ stands for the partition $\epsilon_i(b) \cup l$ if $i \in I^{\text{iso}}$.

Remark 3.19.

- We will use the following notation: $\text{wt}_i = \langle e_i, \text{wt}\rangle$.

- Note that this definition of ϕ_i already appears in [JKK05]. Also note that since we will only be interested in normal crystals (see 3.22), we require $|\epsilon_i|$ and ϕ to be non-negative, except if $\epsilon_i = -\infty$ in which case we set $|\epsilon_i| = -\infty$.
- Set $\tilde{e}_{i,\mathsf{c}} = \tilde{e}_{i,\mathsf{c}_1} \dots \tilde{e}_{i,\mathsf{c}_r}$ and $\tilde{f}_{i,\mathsf{c}} = \tilde{f}_{i,\mathsf{c}_1} \dots \tilde{f}_{i,\mathsf{c}_r}$ for every $\mathsf{c} = (\mathsf{c}_1, \dots, \mathsf{c}_r)$. Set $\bar{\mathsf{c}} = (\mathsf{c}_r \dots, \mathsf{c}_1)$ if $\omega_i \geq 2$, $\bar{\mathsf{c}} = \mathsf{c}$ if $\omega_i \leq 1$. We have:

$$\tilde{f}_{i,\mathsf{c}} b = b' \Leftrightarrow b = \tilde{e}_{i,\bar{\mathsf{c}}} b'.$$

Example 3.20. For every vertex i, we define a crystal $\mathcal{B}_i$ by endowing $\mathcal{C}_i$ with the following maps:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{wt}(\mathsf{c}) &= -|\mathsf{c}|\alpha_i \\ \epsilon_i(\mathsf{c}) &= \mathsf{c} \\ \epsilon_j(\mathsf{c}) &= -\infty \text{ if } j \neq i. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the definition of $\tilde{e}_{i,l}, \tilde{f}_{i,l}$ is dictated by the one of ϵ_i, together with 3.18 (A5, A6). We will denote by $(0)_i$ the trivial element of $\mathcal{C}_i$.

Definition 3.21. A morphism of crystals $\mathcal{B}_1 \to \mathcal{B}_2$ is a map $\mathcal{B}_1 \sqcup \{0\} \to \mathcal{B}_2 \sqcup \{0\}$ mapping 0 to 0, preserving the weight, ϵ_i, and commuting with the respective actions of the $\tilde{e}_\iota, \tilde{f}_\iota$ on $\mathcal{B}_1$ and $\mathcal{B}_2$.

Definition 3.22. A crystal $\mathcal{B}$ is said to be *normal* if for every $b \in \mathcal{B}$ and $i \in I$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_i(b) &= \overline{\max\{\bar{\mathsf{c}} \mid \tilde{e}_{i,\mathsf{c}}(b) \neq 0\}} \\ \phi_i(b) &= \max\{|\mathsf{c}| \mid \tilde{f}_{i,\mathsf{c}}(b) \neq 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 3.23. The *tensor product* $\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{B}' = \{b \otimes b' \mid b \in \mathcal{B}, b' \in \mathcal{B}'\}$ of two crystals is defined by:

(1) $\mathrm{wt}(b \otimes b') = \mathrm{wt}(b) + \mathrm{wt}(b')$;

(2) if $i \in I^{\mathrm{re}}$, $\epsilon_i(b \otimes b') = \max\big\{\epsilon_i(b'), \epsilon_i(b) - \mathrm{wt}_i(b')\big\}$;

(3) if $i \in I^{\mathrm{im}}$, $\epsilon_i(b \otimes b') = \begin{cases} \epsilon_i(b') & \text{if } \phi_i(b) \geq |\epsilon_i(b')| \\ \epsilon_i(b) & \text{if } \phi_i(b) < |\epsilon_i(b')|; \end{cases}$

(4) if $i \in I^{\mathrm{re}}$, $\phi_i(b \otimes b') = \max\big\{\phi_i(b') + \mathrm{wt}_i(b), \phi_i(b)\big\}$;

(5) if $i \in I^{\mathrm{im}}$, $\phi_i(b \otimes b') = \begin{cases} \phi_i(b') & \text{if } \phi_i(b) \geq |\epsilon_i(b')| \\ \phi_i(b) & \text{if } \phi_i(b) < |\epsilon_i(b')|; \end{cases}$

(6) for every $\iota = (i,l) \in I_\infty$, $\tilde{e}_\iota(b \otimes b') = \begin{cases} b \otimes \tilde{e}_\iota(b') & \text{if } \phi_i(b') \geq |\epsilon_i(b)| \\ \tilde{e}_\iota(b) \otimes b' & \text{if } \phi_i(b') < |\epsilon_i(b)|; \end{cases}$

(7) for every $\iota = (i,l) \in I_\infty$, $\tilde{f}_\iota(b \otimes b') = \begin{cases} b \otimes \tilde{f}_\iota(b') & \text{if } \phi_i(b') > |\epsilon_i(b)| \\ \tilde{f}_\iota(b) \otimes b' & \text{if } \phi_i(b') \leq |\epsilon_i(b)|. \end{cases}$

Remark 3.24. Note that when i is imaginary, the condition $\phi_i(b') > |\epsilon_i(b)|$ is equivalent to:

$$\phi_i(b') = +\infty \text{ or } [\phi_i(b') = 0 \text{ and } \epsilon_i(b) = -\infty],$$

and $\phi_i(b') = |\epsilon_i(b)|$ is equivalent to $\phi_i(b') = 0 = |\epsilon_i(b)|$.

Proposition 3.25. *$\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{B}'$ is a crystal if $\mathcal{B}'$ is normal.*

Proof. Note that the result is already known if $I^{\text{im}} = \varnothing$, hence we just have to check the axioms of 3.18 that concern imaginary vertices. Axioms (A1), (A2), (A3) and (A7) are clearly satisfied.

To prove that (A4) is satisfied, we first consider b and b' such that $\tilde{e}_{i,l}(b \otimes b') \neq 0$. If $\phi_i(b') \geq |\epsilon_i(b)|$, we have $\tilde{e}_{i,l}(b \otimes b') = b \otimes \tilde{e}_{i,l}(b')$. The crystal $\mathcal{B}'$ being normal, $\phi_i(\tilde{e}_{i,l}(b')) > 0$ since $\tilde{f}_{i,l}\tilde{e}_{i,l}(b') = b' \neq 0$. But i is imaginary, so by definition $\phi_i(\tilde{e}_{i,l}(b')) \in \{0, +\infty\}$, and we get $\phi_i(\tilde{e}_{i,l}(b')) = +\infty$. Also by definition, $|\epsilon_i(b)| < +\infty$, hence we get:

$$\tilde{f}_{i,l}(b \otimes \tilde{e}_{i,l}b') = b \otimes \tilde{f}_{i,l}\tilde{e}_{i,l}b' = b \otimes b'.$$

If $\phi_i(b') < |\epsilon_i(b)|$, we have $\tilde{e}_{i,l}(b \otimes b') = \tilde{e}_{i,l}(b) \otimes b'$, where $|\epsilon_i(\tilde{e}_{i,l}(b))| = |\epsilon_i(b)| - l$ is necessarily nonnegative by definition of ϵ_i. Also, $\phi_i(b')$ can not be equal to $+\infty$, hence is 0, and:

$$\tilde{f}_{i,l}(\tilde{e}_{i,l}(b) \otimes b') = \tilde{f}_{i,l}(\tilde{e}_{i,l}(b)) \otimes b' = b \otimes b'.$$

Assume now that $\tilde{f}_{i,l}(b \otimes b') \neq 0$. If $\phi_i(b') > |\epsilon_i(b)|$, we get $\tilde{f}_{i,l}(b \otimes b') = b \otimes \tilde{f}_{i,l}b'$. If $\epsilon_i(b) = -\infty$, we have $\phi_i(\tilde{f}_{i,l}b') > \epsilon_i(b)$. Otherwise, we necessarily have $\phi_i(b') = +\infty$. But:

$$\text{wt}_i(\tilde{f}_{i,l}(b')) = \text{wt}_i(b') - l\langle e_i, \alpha_i \rangle \geq \text{wt}_i(b')$$

since $\langle e_i, \alpha_i \rangle \leq 0$ for every $i \in I^{\text{im}}$. Hence $\phi_i(\tilde{f}_{i,l}(b')) = +\infty$, and:

$$\tilde{e}_{i,l}(b \otimes \tilde{f}_{i,l}b') = b \otimes \tilde{e}_{i,l}\tilde{f}_{i,l}b' = b \otimes b'.$$

If $\phi_i(b') \leq |\epsilon_i(b)|$, then $\tilde{f}_{i,l}(b \otimes b') = \tilde{f}_{i,l}(b) \otimes b'$, where:

$$|\epsilon_i(\tilde{f}_{i,l}(b))| = |\epsilon_i(b)| + l > |\epsilon_i(b)| \geq \phi_i(b'),$$

hence:

$$\tilde{e}_{i,l}(\tilde{f}_{i,l}(b) \otimes b') = \tilde{e}_{i,l}(\tilde{f}_{i,l}(b)) \otimes b' = b \otimes b'.$$

From the definitions and the proof of (A4) above, it is easy to check that:

$$\epsilon_i(\tilde{e}_{i,l}(b \otimes b')) = \begin{cases} \epsilon_i(\tilde{e}_{i,l}b') & \text{if } \epsilon_i(b \otimes b') = \epsilon_i(b') \\ \epsilon_i(\tilde{e}_{i,l}b) & \text{if } \epsilon_i(b \otimes b') = \epsilon_i(b), \end{cases}$$

hence (A5) is satisfied by $\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{B}'$ since it is by $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{B}'$. For the same reasons, (A6) is satisfied, except if $\phi_i(b') = |\epsilon_i(b)|$, which can only happen if both are equal to 0 (we still consider $i \in I^{\text{im}}$). But then $\tilde{e}_{i,l}(b') = 0$, so there is nothing to prove. Otherwise we would have $\tilde{f}_{i,l}\tilde{e}_{i,l}b' = b' \neq 0$, hence $\phi_i(\tilde{e}_{i,l}b') = +\infty$ by normality. But then:

$$\text{wt}_i(b') = \text{wt}_i(\tilde{e}_{i,l}(b')) - l\langle e_i, \alpha_i \rangle \geq \text{wt}_i(\tilde{e}_{i,l}(b')) > 0$$

would imply $\phi_i(b') = +\infty$ which contradicts the assumption. □

3.4. **The crystal $\mathcal{B}(\infty)$.**

3.4.1. *Algebraic definition.* Let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{Q}(v^{-1})$ be the subring consisting of rational functions without pole at $v^{-1} = 0$, and $\mathcal{L}(\infty)$ be the sub-$\mathcal{A}$-module of U^- generated by the elements $\tilde{f}_{\iota_1} \dots \tilde{f}_{\iota_s}.1$, where $\iota_k \in I_\infty$ and the operators $\tilde{f}_\iota$ are those defined in 3.17 together with the original ones for $\iota = i \in I^{\mathrm{re}}$. Define the following set:

$$\mathcal{B}(\infty) = \{\tilde{f}_{\iota_1} \dots \tilde{f}_{\iota_s}.1 \mid \iota_k \in I_\infty\} \subset \frac{\mathcal{L}(\infty)}{v^{-1}\mathcal{L}(\infty)}.$$

The following theorem will be proved in section 3.6:

Theorem 3.26. *The Kashiwara operators are still defined on $\mathcal{B}(\infty)$, which is a crystal once equipped with the following maps:*

$$\mathrm{wt}(b) = \sum_{i \in I} \nu_i \alpha_i \text{ if } |b| = \nu \in -\mathbb{N}I$$
$$\epsilon_i(b) = \overline{\max\{\overline{\mathsf{c}} \mid \tilde{e}_{i,\mathsf{c}}(b) \neq 0\}}.$$

We have the following characterization, analogous to [KS97, 3.2.3]:

Proposition 3.27. *Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a crystal, and $b_0 \in \mathcal{B}$ with weight 0, such that:*

1. $\mathrm{wt}(\mathcal{B}) \subset -\sum_{i \in I} \mathbb{N}\alpha_i$;
2. *the only element of $\mathcal{B}$ with weight 0 is b_0;*
3. $\epsilon_i(b_0) = 0$ *for every $i \in I$;*
4. *there exists a strict embedding $\Psi_i : \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{B}_i \otimes \mathcal{B}$ for every $i \in I$;*
5. *for every $b \neq b_0$ there exists $i \in I$ such that $\Psi_i(b) = \mathsf{c} \otimes b'$ for some $b' \in \mathcal{B}$ and $\mathsf{c} \in \mathcal{C}_i \setminus \{(0)_i\}$.*
6. *for every i, the crystal $\mathcal{B}'_i = \pi_i \Psi_i(\mathcal{B})$ is normal, where π_i is the second projection $\mathcal{B}_i \otimes \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{B}$.*

Then $\mathcal{B} \simeq \mathcal{B}(\infty)$.

Remark 3.28. The crystal structure we consider on $\mathcal{B}'_i$ is $(\pi_i\Psi_i)_*\mathcal{B}$. If $b' \in \mathcal{B}'_i$, we get $\tilde{e}_\iota(b') = 0$ (respectively $\tilde{f}_\iota(b') = 0$) if, with respect to the structure of $\mathcal{B}$, $\tilde{e}_\iota(b') \in \mathcal{B} \setminus \mathcal{B}'_i$ (respectively $\tilde{f}_\iota(b') \in \mathcal{B} \setminus \mathcal{B}'_i$).

Proof. First note that we necessarily have $\Psi_i(b_0) = (0)_i \otimes b_0$, thanks to (1). Let us show that that for any $b \in \mathcal{B} \setminus \{b_0\}$ there exists $\iota \in I_\infty$ such that $\tilde{e}_\iota(b) \neq 0$. Consider $i \in I$ such that $\Psi_i(b) = \mathsf{c} \otimes b'$ for some $b' \in \mathcal{B}$ and nontrivial $\mathsf{c} \in \mathcal{C}_i$, and assume i is imaginary since the result is already known from [KS97, 3.2.3] when i is real. If $b' = b_0$, since $\phi_i(b_0) = 0$, we have $\tilde{e}_{i,\mathsf{c}_1}(b) = \mathsf{c}\backslash\mathsf{c}_1 \otimes b_0 \neq 0$. Otherwise by induction on the weight, we can assume that there exists $\iota \in I_\infty$ such that $\tilde{e}_\iota(b') \neq 0$. If $\iota = (j, 1)$ for some real vertex j, we get $\tilde{e}_\iota(b) \neq 0$. If $\iota = (j, l)$ for some imaginary vertex j, we have to prove that $\phi_j(b') = +\infty$ to get to the same result. But we have $b' = \tilde{f}_{j,l}\tilde{e}_{j,l}b' \neq 0$, hence $\phi_j(\tilde{e}_{j,l}(b')) \neq 0$ by normality of $\mathcal{B}'_j$. Since $(j, j) \leq 0$, we have:

$$\mathrm{wt}_j(b') = \mathrm{wt}_j(\tilde{e}_{j,l}(b')) - l\langle e_j, \alpha_j\rangle \geq \mathrm{wt}_j(\tilde{e}_{j,l}(b')) > 0,$$

hence $\phi_j(b') = +\infty$, and:

$$\Psi_i(\tilde{e}_{j,l}(b)) = \tilde{e}_{j,l}(\mathsf{c} \otimes b') = \mathsf{c} \otimes \tilde{e}_{j,l}(b') \neq 0,$$

which proves that $\tilde{e}_{j,l}(b) \neq 0$.

Hence any element can be written $b = \tilde{f}_{\iota_1} \dots \tilde{f}_{\iota_1}(b_0)$ for some $\iota_k \in I_\infty$. The end of the proof is analogous to the one given in [KS97], one just has to replace I by I_∞ (which is countably infinite). □

3.4.2. *Geometric realization.*

Notations 3.29. From 1.14, we have the following bijections:

$$\operatorname{Irr}\Lambda(\nu)_{i,l} \xrightarrow[\sim]{\mathfrak{k}_{i,l}} \operatorname{Irr}\Lambda(\nu - le_i)_{i,0} \times \mathcal{C}_{i,l}$$

where $\nu \in P^+ = \mathbb{N}^I$, $i \in I$, $l > 0$. Set, for $\mathsf{c} \in \mathcal{C}_{i,l}$:

$$\operatorname{Irr}\Lambda_{i,l} = \bigsqcup_{\nu \in P^+} \operatorname{Irr}\Lambda(\nu)_{i,l}$$
$$\operatorname{Irr}\Lambda(\nu)_{i,\mathsf{c}} = \mathfrak{k}_{i,l}^{-1}(\operatorname{Irr}\Lambda(\nu - le_i)_{i,0} \times \{\mathsf{c}\})$$
$$\operatorname{Irr}\Lambda_{i,\mathsf{c}} = \bigsqcup_{\nu \in P^+} \operatorname{Irr}\Lambda(\nu)_{i,\mathsf{c}}$$
$$\operatorname{Irr}\Lambda = \bigsqcup_{\nu \in P^+} \operatorname{Irr}\Lambda(\nu)$$

and denote by $\tilde{e}_{i,\mathsf{c}}$ and $\tilde{f}_{i,\mathsf{c}}$ the inverse bijections:

$$\tilde{e}_{i,\mathsf{c}} : \operatorname{Irr}\Lambda_{i,\mathsf{c}} \rightleftarrows \operatorname{Irr}\Lambda_{i,0} : \tilde{f}_{i,\mathsf{c}}$$

induced by $\mathfrak{k}_{i,l}$. Then, for every $l > 0$, we define:

$$\tilde{e}_{i,l} = \bigsqcup_{\mathsf{c} \in \mathcal{C}_i} \tilde{f}_{i,\mathsf{c}\backslash l}\tilde{e}_{i,\mathsf{c}} : \operatorname{Irr}\Lambda \to \operatorname{Irr}\Lambda \sqcup \{0\}$$
$$\tilde{f}_{i,l} = \tilde{f}_{i,(l)} \sqcup \Big(\bigsqcup_{\mathsf{c} \in \mathcal{C}_i} \tilde{f}_{i,(l,\mathsf{c})}\tilde{e}_{i,\mathsf{c}} \Big) : \operatorname{Irr}\Lambda \to \operatorname{Irr}\Lambda \sqcup \{0\}$$

where $\tilde{f}_{i,\mathsf{c}\backslash l} = 0$ if $\omega_i \geq 2$ and $l \neq \mathsf{c}_1$, or if $\omega_i = 1$ and $m_l(\mathsf{c}) = 0$.

It is obvious from the definitions that we have:

Proposition 3.30. *The set* $\operatorname{Irr}\Lambda$ *is a crystal with respect to* $\operatorname{wt} : Z \in \operatorname{Irr}\Lambda(\nu) \mapsto -C\nu$, ϵ_i *the composition of* $\sqcup_{l>0}\mathfrak{k}_{i,l}$ *and the second projection, and* $\tilde{e}_{i,l}, \tilde{f}_{i,l}$ *the maps defined above.*

The duality $\Lambda \to \Lambda$, $x \mapsto x^*$ induces a bijection $* : \operatorname{Irr}\Lambda \to \operatorname{Irr}\Lambda$, $Z \mapsto Z^*$ preserving the grading. Following [KS97], we note:

$$\epsilon_i^* = *\epsilon_i *$$
$$\tilde{e}_{i,l}^* = *\tilde{e}_{i,l} *$$
$$\tilde{f}_{i,l}^* = *\tilde{f}_{i,l} * .$$

Note that $\epsilon_i^*(Z)$ is the dimension of the largest subspace of $\cap_{h \in H_i} \ker x_h$ stable by $(x_h)_{h \in H_i}$, for a generic element $x \in Z$. We will note $\tilde{e}_i^{*\max}(Z)$ instead of $\tilde{e}_{i,\mathsf{c}}(Z)$ when $\mathsf{c} = \epsilon_i^*(Z)$. We have the following, corresponding to [KS97, 5.3.1] when i is real:

Proposition 3.31. *Consider* $Z \in \operatorname{Irr}\Lambda(\nu)$ *such that* $\epsilon_i^*(Z) = \mathsf{c} \neq 0$ *for some imaginary vertex* i*, and set* $\bar{Z} = \tilde{e}_{i,\mathsf{c}}^*(Z)$*. Assume* $\operatorname{wt}_i(\bar{Z}) > 0$*. We have:*

(1) $\epsilon_i(Z) = \epsilon_i(\bar{Z})$;

(2) $\begin{cases} \epsilon_i^*(\tilde{e}_\iota(Z)) = \epsilon_i^*(Z) \\ \tilde{e}_i^{*\max}(\tilde{e}_\iota(Z)) = \tilde{e}_\iota(\bar{Z}) \end{cases}$ *for every* $\iota \in I_\infty$.

Proof. The proof is actually simpler than in the real case. Indeed, in the proof of 1.14, consider $y \in \bar{Z}^*$ and $z \in \mathsf{c}^*$ (we abusively identify $\operatorname{Irr}\Lambda(le)$ with $\mathcal{C}_{i,l}$). We want:

$$0 = \sum_{h \in H_i} y_{\bar{h}}\eta_h + \sum_{h \in \Omega(i)} \big[(y_{\bar{h}}\eta_h - \eta_h z_{\bar{h}}) + (y_h\eta_{\bar{h}} - \eta_{\bar{h}} z_h)\big].$$

Note that:

$$0 < \mathrm{wt}_i(\bar{Z}) = \sum_{h \in H_i} \nu_{t(h)} - (i,i)(\nu_i - |\mathsf{c}|) \Leftrightarrow 0 < \sum_{h \in H_i} \nu_{t(h)}$$

since $(i,i) \leq 0$, and since it is impossible to have $\sum_{h \in H_i} \nu_{t(h)} = 0$ and $\nu_i - |\mathsf{c}| > 0$. Hence there exists $h_0 \in H_i$ such that $\nu_{h_0} > 0$. We have $\operatorname{Spec}(z_{\bar{h}_1}) \cap \operatorname{Spec}(y_{\bar{h}_1}) = \varnothing$ for a generic choice of y, z, where $h_1 \in \Omega(i)$. But then the map:

$$\eta_{h_1} \mapsto y_{\bar{h}_1}\eta_{h_1} - \eta_{h_1} z_{\bar{h}_1}$$

is invertible, and we can generically choose η_{h_0} so that:

$$\dim \mathbb{C}\langle z_h^* \mid h \in H_i\rangle . \operatorname{Im} \eta_{h_0}^* = |\mathsf{c}|.$$

This proves $\epsilon_i^*(Z^*) = \epsilon_i^*(\bar{Z}^*)$, hence (1). The second statement directly follows from the proof of (1). □

Theorem 3.32. *We have* $\operatorname{Irr}\Lambda \simeq \mathcal{B}(\infty)$.

Proof. Set $\Psi_i(Z) = \epsilon_i^*(Z) \otimes \tilde{e}_i^{*\max}(Z)$, which is clearly injective. By 3.31 and the definition of our generalized crystals, Ψ_i is a morphism. Note that we have $\Psi(\tilde{e}_{i,l}(Z)) = \tilde{e}_{i,l}(\epsilon_i^*(Z)) \otimes \bar{Z}$ if $\mathrm{wt}_i(\bar{Z}) = 0$. By 1.13 (or its dual analog), the condition (5) of 3.27 is satisfied. The condition (6) is satisfied because it is clear that $\tilde{f}_{i,l}(\bar{Z}) \notin \mathcal{B}_i'$ if $\phi_i(\bar{Z}) = 0$. Hence we get the result. □

3.4.3. *Semicanonical basis.* The following proposition is proved in [Boz13]:

Proposition 3.33. *There exists a surjective morphism* $\Phi : U_{v=1}^+ \to \mathcal{M}_\circ$ *defined by:*

$$\begin{cases} E_{i,a} \mapsto 1_{i,l} & \text{if } i \in I^{\mathrm{im}} \\ E_i \mapsto 1_i & \text{if } i \in I^{\mathrm{re}}. \end{cases}$$

Thanks to 3.32, we now have:

Theorem 3.34. *The morphism* Φ *is an isomorphism* $U_{v=1}^+ \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{M}_\circ$.

Proof. The family $(f_Z)_{Z \in \operatorname{Irr}\Lambda}$ is clearly free, so we have:

$$|\operatorname{Irr}\Lambda(\nu)| \leq \dim \mathcal{M}_\circ(\nu) \leq \dim U_{v=1}^+[\nu],$$

the latter inequality being true thanks to 3.33. From 3.32, we have $|\operatorname{Irr}\Lambda(\nu)| = \dim U_{v=1}^+[\nu]$, hence $(f_Z)_{Z \in \operatorname{Irr}\Lambda}$ is a basis of $\mathcal{M}_\circ$, and Φ is an isomorphism. □

Definition 3.35. The semicanonical basis of $U_{v=1}^+$ is the pullback of $(f_Z)_{Z \in \operatorname{Irr}\Lambda}$.

3.5. **The crystals** $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$**.**

3.5.1. *Algebraic definition.* We will use the *fundamental weights* $(\Lambda_i)_{i\in I}$ defined by $(i,\Lambda_j)=\delta_{i,j}$ for every $i,j\in I$. Note that the isomorphism $P\xrightarrow{\sim}\sum\mathbb{Z}\Lambda_i$, $e_i\mapsto\Lambda_i$ maps α_i to i. We use this isomorphism to identify $\sum\mathbb{Z}\Lambda_i$ with P and $\sum\mathbb{N}\Lambda_i$ with P^+. We call *dominant* the elements $\lambda\in P^+$, which are the ones satisfying $(i,\lambda)\geq 0$ for every $i\in I$.

Definition 3.36. We denote by $\mathcal{O}$ the category of U-modules satisfying:

(1) $M=\oplus_{\mu\in P}M_\mu$ where $M_\mu=\{m\in M\mid\forall i,\ K_im=v^{(\mu,i)}m\}$;

(2) For any $m\in M$, there exists $p\geq 0$ such that $xm=0$ as soon as $x\in U^+[\nu]$ and $\mathrm{ht}(\nu)\geq p$.

For any $\lambda\in P$, we define a *Verma module*:

$$M(\lambda)=\frac{U}{\sum_{\iota\in I_\infty}UE_\iota+\sum_{i\in I}U\big(K_i-v^{(i,\lambda)}\big)}\in\mathcal{O}$$

and the following simple quotient:

$$\pi_\lambda:U\twoheadrightarrow V(\lambda)=\frac{M(\lambda)}{M(\lambda)^-}\in\mathcal{O}$$

where $M(\lambda)^-$ is the sum of all strict submodules of $M(\lambda)$. We will denote by $v_\lambda\in V(\lambda)_\lambda$ the image of $1\in U$.

Remark 3.37. Note that thanks to 3.14 (2), we have a triangular decomposition, and thus $M(\lambda)=U^-v_\lambda$.

We have the following proposition, generalizing the case $i\in I^{\mathrm{re}}$:

Proposition 3.38. *Assume $(i,\lambda)\geq 0$ for some imaginary vertex i. Then we have the following decomposition:*

$$V(\lambda)=\bigoplus_{\mathsf{c}\in\mathcal{C}_i}b_{i,\mathsf{c}}\mathcal{K}_i$$

where $\mathcal{K}_i=\bigcap_{l>0}\ker E_{i,l}$.

Proof. Let's first prove the existence. Consider $v\in V(\lambda)$, and assume first that v is of the following form: $v=ub_{i,\mathsf{c}}z$ for some $\mathsf{c}\in\mathcal{C}_i$, $u\in U^-$ satisfying $[a_{i,l},u]=0$ for every l, and $z\in\mathcal{K}_i$. We proceed by induction on $|\mathsf{c}|$. First note that if $(i,|u|)=0$, since i is imaginary one necessarily has:

$$\mathrm{supp}|u|\subseteq\{j\in I\mid(i,j)=0\}.$$

Hence $[u,b_{i,l}]=0$ for any l (whether i is isotropic or not) and we get the result by induction. Otherwise, $(i,|u|)>0$, and we set:

$$\begin{aligned}l&=\mathsf{c}_1\\ [u,b_{i,l}]^\circ&=ub_{i,l}-R(v)b_{i,l}u\text{ for some }R\in\mathbb{Q}(v)\\ z'&=b_{i,\mathsf{c}\setminus\mathsf{c}_1}z\in V(\lambda)_\mu.\end{aligned}$$

For any $k > 0$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}[a_{i,k}, [u, b_{i,l}]^\circ]z' &= \delta_{l,k}\tau_{i,l}\big\{u(K_{-li} - K_{li}) - R(v)(K_{-li} - K_{li})u\big\}z' \\ &\qquad [\textit{ c.f. } 3.14\ (2)\ ] \\ &= \delta_{l,k}\tau_{i,l}u\big\{(v^{-l(i,\mu)} - v^{l(i,\mu)}) \\ &\qquad\qquad - R(v)(v^{-l(i,|u|+\mu)} - v^{l(i,|u|+\mu)})\big\}z' \\ &= 0\end{aligned}$$

if:

$$R(v) = \frac{v^{-l(i,\mu)} - v^{l(i,\mu)}}{v^{-l(i,|u|+\mu)} - v^{l(i,|u|+\mu)}},$$

which is possible since:

$$(i, |u| + \mu) = (i, \lambda) + (i, |u|) + (i, \mu - \lambda) > (i, \lambda) + (i, \mu - \lambda) \geq 0.$$

We have used that since i is imaginary, we have:

$$\mu - \lambda \in -\mathbb{N}I \Rightarrow (i, \mu - \lambda) \geq 0.$$

Hence, the following equality:

$$v = [u, b_{i,l}]^\circ b_{i,\mathsf{c}\backslash\mathsf{c}_1} z + R(v) b_{i,l} u b_{i,\mathsf{c}\backslash\mathsf{c}_1} z$$

along with the induction hypothesis allow us to conclude since $|\mathsf{c}\backslash\mathsf{c}_1| < |\mathsf{c}|$, and since $\oplus_{\mathsf{c}\in\mathcal{C}_i} b_{i,\mathsf{c}}\mathcal{K}_i$ is stable by left-multiplication by $b_{i,l}$.

Then, we prove the existence of the decompostion for a general $v \in V(\lambda)_\mu$, using induction on $\sum(\lambda_i - \mu_i)$. If $v \neq v_\lambda$, thanks to 3.37, we can write:

$$v = \sum_{\iota\in I_\infty} b_\iota v_\iota$$

for some finitely many nonzero $v_\iota \in V(\lambda)$. Thanks to our induction hypothesis, we have:

$$v = \sum_{\iota\in I_\infty, \mathsf{c}\in\mathcal{C}_i} b_\iota b_{i,\mathsf{c}} z_{\iota,\mathsf{c}}$$

for some finitely many nonzero $z_{\iota,\mathsf{c}} \in \mathcal{K}_i$. Then:

$$v = \sum_{l>0, \mathsf{c}\in\mathcal{C}_i} b_{i,(l,\mathsf{c})} z_{(i,l),\mathsf{c}} + \sum_{\substack{\iota\in I_\infty\backslash(\{i\}\times\mathbb{N}_{>0}) \\ \mathsf{c}\in\mathcal{C}_i}} b_\iota b_{i,\mathsf{c}} z_{\iota,\mathsf{c}}$$

and we have the result since $b_\iota b_{i,\mathsf{c}} z_{\iota,\mathsf{c}}$ is of the form $u b_{i,\mathsf{c}} z$ already treated. Indeed, thanks to 3.14 (2), $[a_{i,l}, b_{j,k}] = 0$ for any $l, k > 0$ if $j \neq i$.

To prove the unicity of the decomposition, consider a minimal nontrivial relation of dependance:

$$0 = \sum_{\mathsf{c}\in\mathcal{C}_i} b_{i,\mathsf{c}} z_{\mathsf{c}},$$

where $z_{\mathsf{c}} \in V(\lambda)_{\mu+|\mathsf{c}|i} \cap \mathcal{K}_i$. We have to considerate separately the cases $i \in I^{\text{iso}}$ and $i \notin I^{\text{iso}}$. First, consider $i \notin I^{\text{iso}}$. Consider r maximal such that there exists $\mathsf{c} = (\mathsf{c}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{c}_r)$ such that $z_{\mathsf{c}} \neq 0$. Set for any $k \in [\![1, r]\!]$:

$$\mathsf{c}_{<k} = (\mathsf{c}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{c}_{k-1})$$
$$\mathsf{c}_{>k} = (\mathsf{c}_{k+1}, \ldots, \mathsf{c}_r)$$

with the convention $\mathsf{c}_{<1} = \varnothing = \mathsf{c}_{>r}$. Then, if $l > 0$, we get the following from 3.14 (2), where by convention $b_{i,\varnothing} = 1$:

$$\begin{aligned}[a_{i,l}, b_{i,\mathsf{c}}] &= \tau_{i,l} \sum_{k:\mathsf{c}_k=l} b_{i,\mathsf{c}_{<k}}(K_{-li} - K_{li})b_{i,\mathsf{c}_{>k}} \\ &= \tau_{i,l} \sum_{k:\mathsf{c}_k=l} b_{i,\mathsf{c}\setminus\mathsf{c}_k}(v_i^{2l|\mathsf{c}_{>k}|}K_{-li} - v_i^{-2l|\mathsf{c}_{>k}|}K_{li}).\end{aligned}$$

Then, since $z_{\mathsf{c}} \in \mathcal{K}_i$:

$$\begin{aligned}a_{i,l}b_{i,\mathsf{c}}z_{\mathsf{c}} &= \tau_{i,l} \sum_{k:\mathsf{c}_k=l} b_{i,\mathsf{c}\setminus\mathsf{c}_k}(v_i^{2l|\mathsf{c}_{>k}|}K_{-li} - v_i^{-2l|\mathsf{c}_{>k}|}K_{li})z_{\mathsf{c}} \\ &= \tau_{i,l} \sum_{k:\mathsf{c}_k=l} b_{i,\mathsf{c}\setminus\mathsf{c}_k}(v^{-l(i,\mu+|\mathsf{c}_{\leq k}|i)} - v^{l(i,\mu+|\mathsf{c}_{\leq k}|i)})z_{\mathsf{c}}\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathsf{c}_{\leq k} = (\mathsf{c}_{<k}, \mathsf{c}_k)$. We see that for any $\mathsf{c}' \in \mathfrak{S}_r\mathsf{c}$ (with the convention $(\sigma\mathsf{c})_k = \mathsf{c}_{\sigma(k)}$), since r is maximal, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}0 = a_{i,\mathsf{c}'} \sum_{\mathsf{c}''\in\mathcal{C}_i} b_{i,\mathsf{c}''}z_{\mathsf{c}''} &= a_{i,\mathsf{c}'} \sum_{\mathsf{c}''\in\mathfrak{S}_r\mathsf{c}} b_{i,\mathsf{c}''}z_{\mathsf{c}''} \\ &= \tau_{i,\mathsf{c}} \sum_{\mathsf{c}''\in\mathfrak{S}_r\mathsf{c}} P_{\mathsf{c}',\mathsf{c}''}(v)z_{\mathsf{c}''}\end{aligned}$$

where $P_{\mathsf{c}',\mathsf{c}''}(v) \in \mathbb{Z}[v, v^{-1}]$. Since $(z_{\mathsf{c}''})_{\mathsf{c}''\in\mathfrak{S}_r\mathsf{c}} \neq 0$, we have to prove that:

$$\Delta(v) = \det(P_{\mathsf{c}',\mathsf{c}''}(v))_{\mathsf{c}',\mathsf{c}''\in\mathfrak{S}_r\mathsf{c}} \neq 0 \in \mathbb{Z}[v, v^{-1}]$$

to end our proof in the case $(i, i) < 0$. Note that $\lambda - (\mu + |\mathsf{c}|i) \in \mathbb{N}I$, hence, since i is imaginary:

$$(i, \mu + |\mathsf{c}|i) = (i, \lambda) + (i, \mu + |\mathsf{c}|i - \lambda) \geq 0.$$

Then, for any $\mathsf{c}' \in \mathfrak{S}_r\mathsf{c}$, one has:

$$\max_{\mathsf{c}''\in\mathfrak{S}_r\mathsf{c}}\{\deg(P_{\mathsf{c}',\mathsf{c}''})\} = \deg(P_{\mathsf{c}',\bar{\mathsf{c}}'}) = \sum_{1\leq k\leq r} \mathsf{c}_k(i, \mu + \mathsf{c}_k i) = m$$

which is only reached for $\mathsf{c}'' = \bar{\mathsf{c}}'$. However, this is not true if $m = 0$, which can only happen if our initial relation of dependance is of the form $b_{i,l}z_l = 0$, with $(i, \mu + li) = 0$. But if $(i, \mu + li) = 0$, the module generated by $b_{i,l}z_l$ is a nontrivial strict submodule of $V(\lambda)$ since for every $k > 0$ and $j \neq i$:

$$\begin{aligned}a_{i,k}b_{i,l}z_l &= 0 \\ a_{j,k}b_{i,l}z_l &= b_{i,l}a_{j,k}z_l.\end{aligned}$$

Hence the relation of dependance $b_{i,l}z_l = 0$ is actually trivial by definition of $V(\lambda)$.

Otherwise, the application $\mathfrak{S}_r\mathsf{c} \to \mathfrak{S}_r\mathsf{c}$, $\mathsf{c}' \mapsto \bar{\mathsf{c}}'$ being a permutation, the degree of Δ is $|\mathfrak{S}_r\mathsf{c}|m > 0$, and in particular $\Delta \neq 0$.

We finally have to prove the uniqueness in the case $(i, i) = 0$. Write a relation of dependance of minimal degree:

$$0 = \sum_{\nu\in\mathcal{C}_i} b_{i,\nu}z_\nu,$$

where $z_\nu \in V(\lambda)_{\mu+|\nu|i} \cap \mathcal{K}_i$. For any $l > 0$, we have, thanks to 3.14 (2):

$$\begin{aligned} a_{i,l} \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{C}_i} b_{i,\nu} z_\nu &= \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{C}_i} m_l(\nu) \tau_{i,l} \big(v^{-l(i,\mu)} - v^{l(i,\mu)} \big) b_{i,\nu \backslash l} z_\nu \\ &= \tau_{i,l} \big(v^{-l(i,\mu)} - v^{l(i,\mu)} \big) \sum_{\nu' \in \mathcal{C}_i} b_{i,\nu'} \big\{ (m_l(\nu')+1) z_{\nu' \cup l} \big\} \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts the minimality of the first relation. Note that we can assume that $l(i,\mu) \neq 0$: otherwise we would again have an initial trivial relation of dependance (more precisely for every ν we would have $b_{i,\nu} z_\nu = 0 \in V(\lambda)$). □

This proposition allows us to define Kashiwara operators $\tilde{e}_\iota$, $\tilde{f}_\iota$ on each $V(\lambda)$, exactly as in 3.17:

Definition 3.39. If i is imaginary and $v = \sum_{\mathsf{c} \in \mathcal{C}_i} b_{i,\mathsf{c}} z_\mathsf{c} \in V(\lambda)$, set:

$$\tilde{e}_{i,l}(v) = \begin{cases} \displaystyle\sum_{\mathsf{c}:\mathsf{c}_1 = l} b_{i,\mathsf{c} \backslash \mathsf{c}_1} z_\mathsf{c} & \text{if } i \notin I^{\text{iso}} \\ \displaystyle\sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{C}_i} \sqrt{\frac{m_l(\nu)}{l}} b_{i,\nu \backslash l} z_\nu & \text{if } i \in I^{\text{iso}} \end{cases}$$

$$\tilde{f}_{i,l}(v) = \begin{cases} \displaystyle\sum_{\mathsf{c} \in \mathcal{C}_i} b_{i,(l,\mathsf{c})} z_\mathsf{c} & \text{if } i \notin I^{\text{iso}} \\ \displaystyle\sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{C}_i} \sqrt{\frac{l}{m_l(\nu)+1}} b_{i,\nu \cup l} z_\nu & \text{if } i \in I^{\text{iso}}. \end{cases}$$

The following will be proved in section 3.6:

Theorem 3.40. *Assume λ is dominant. The Kashiwara operators, along with the maps:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{wt}(m) &= \mu \text{ if } m \in V(\lambda)_\mu \\ \epsilon_i(m) &= \overline{\max\{\overline{\mathsf{c}} \mid \tilde{e}_{i,\mathsf{c}}(m) \neq 0\}}, \end{aligned}$$

induce a structure of crystal on:

$$\mathcal{B}(\lambda) = \{ \tilde{f}_{\iota_1} \dots \tilde{f}_{\iota_s} v_\lambda \mid \iota_k \in I_\infty \} \subset \frac{\mathcal{L}(\lambda)}{v^{-1}\mathcal{L}(\lambda)}$$

where:

$$\mathcal{L}(\lambda) = \sum_{\iota_1, \dots, \iota_s} \mathcal{A} \tilde{f}_{\iota_1} \dots \tilde{f}_{\iota_s} v_\lambda.$$

Remark 3.41. These crystals are normal: consider $m \in V(\lambda)_\mu$ and i imaginary (again, the case of real vertices is already known). We have already seen that we necessarily have $(i,\mu) \geq 0$ since λ is dominant. If $(i,\mu) = 0$ for some imaginary vertex i, then $a_\iota b_{i,l} m = b_{i,l} a_\iota m$ for any $\iota \in I_\infty$ (use 3.14 (2) if $\iota = (i,l)$). Hence, for any $l > 0$, the submodule of $V(\lambda)$ spanned by $b_{i,l} m$ is a strict submodule, and we get $\tilde{f}_{i,l} m = 0$.

Otherwise, $(i,\mu) > 0$, and for every $\mu' \in -\mathbb{N}I$, since $(i,i) \leq 0$, we get:

$$(i, \mu + \mu') = (i,\mu) + (i,\mu') \geq (i,\mu) > 0,$$

hence $\max\{|\mathsf{c}| \mid b_{i,\mathsf{c}} m \neq 0\} = +\infty$.

3.5.2. *Geometric realization.*

Notations 3.42. Consider λ dominant. We have the following bijections:

$$\mathrm{Irr}\,\mathfrak{L}(\nu,\lambda)_{i,l} \xrightarrow[\sim]{\mathfrak{l}_{i,l}} \mathrm{Irr}\,\mathfrak{L}(\nu - le_i,\lambda)_{i,0} \times \mathcal{C}_{i,l}$$

each time the left hand side is non-empty (*c.f.* 2.17). Set, for $\mathsf{c} \in \mathcal{C}_{i,l}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Irr}\,\mathfrak{L}(\lambda)_{i,l} &= \bigsqcup_{\nu\in P^+} \mathrm{Irr}\,\mathfrak{L}(\nu,\lambda)_{i,l}\\
\mathrm{Irr}\,\mathfrak{L}(\nu,\lambda)_{i,\mathsf{c}} &= \mathfrak{l}_{i,l}^{-1}(\mathrm{Irr}\,\mathfrak{L}(\nu - le_i,\lambda)_{i,0} \times \{\mathsf{c}\})\\
\mathrm{Irr}\,\mathfrak{L}(\lambda)_{i,\mathsf{c}} &= \bigsqcup_{\nu\in P^+} \mathrm{Irr}\,\mathfrak{L}(\nu,\lambda)_{i,\mathsf{c}}\\
\mathrm{Irr}\,\mathfrak{L}(\lambda) &= \bigsqcup_{\nu\in P^+} \mathrm{Irr}\,\mathfrak{L}(\nu,\lambda)
\end{aligned}$$

and denote by $\tilde{e}_{i,\mathsf{c}}$ and $\tilde{f}_{i,\mathsf{c}}$ the inverse bijections:

$$\tilde{e}_{i,\mathsf{c}} : \mathrm{Irr}\,\mathfrak{L}(\lambda)_{i,\mathsf{c}} \rightleftarrows \mathrm{Irr}\,\mathfrak{L}(\lambda)_{i,0} : \tilde{f}_{i,\mathsf{c}}$$

induced by $\mathfrak{l}_{i,l}$. Then, for every $l > 0$, we define:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{e}_{i,l} &= \bigsqcup_{\mathsf{c}\in\mathcal{C}_i} \tilde{f}_{i,\mathsf{c}\setminus\mathsf{c}_1}\tilde{e}_{i,\mathsf{c}} : \mathrm{Irr}\,\mathfrak{L}(\lambda) \to \mathrm{Irr}\,\mathfrak{L}(\lambda) \sqcup \{0\}\\
\tilde{f}_{i,l} &= \tilde{f}_{i,(l)} \sqcup \Big(\bigsqcup_{\mathsf{c}\in\mathcal{C}_i} \tilde{f}_{i,(l,\mathsf{c})}\tilde{e}_{i,\mathsf{c}}\Big) : \mathrm{Irr}\,\mathfrak{L}(\lambda) \to \mathrm{Irr}\,\mathfrak{L}(\lambda) \sqcup \{0\}
\end{aligned}$$

with the same conventions than in 3.29.

The following is a direct consequence of 2.17:

Proposition 3.43. *The set* $\mathrm{Irr}\,\mathfrak{L}(\lambda)$ *is a crystal with respect to:*

$$\mathrm{wt} : b \in \mathrm{Irr}\,\mathfrak{L}(\nu,\lambda) \mapsto \lambda - C\nu,$$

ϵ_i *the composition of* $\sqcup_{l>0}\mathfrak{l}_{i,l}$ *and the second projection, and* $\tilde{e}_{i,l}, \tilde{f}_{i,l}$ *the maps defined above.*

Remark 3.44. Thanks to 2.17 and the classical case, we have, for every $i \in I$:

$$\phi_i(b) = \max\{|\mathsf{c}| \in \mathbb{N} \mid \tilde{f}_{i,\mathsf{c}}(b) \neq 0\}.$$

Indeed, for $b \in \mathrm{Irr}\,\mathfrak{L}(\nu,\lambda)$, it is impossible to have $\nu_i > 0$ and $\lambda_i + \sum_{h\in H_i} \nu_{t(h)} = 0$, hence:

$$\lambda_i + \sum_{h\in H_i} \nu_{t(h)} > 0 \Leftrightarrow \langle e_i, \lambda - C\nu\rangle > 0,$$

and $\mathrm{Irr}\,\mathfrak{L}(\lambda)$ is normal.

In an analogous way, one can equip $\mathrm{Irr}\,\widetilde{\mathfrak{Z}}$ with a structure of crystal, thanks to 2.25, and get:

Theorem 3.45. *The crystal structure on* $\mathrm{Irr}\,\widetilde{\mathfrak{Z}}$ *coincides with that of the tensor product* $\mathrm{Irr}\,\mathfrak{L}(\lambda) \otimes \mathrm{Irr}\,\mathfrak{L}(\lambda')$.

Proof. This is essentially 2.30. □

We will see in section 3.6 how the previous theorem leads to the following:

Theorem 3.46. *If λ is dominant, we have the following isomorphism of crystals $\mathcal{B}(\lambda) \simeq \mathrm{Irr}\,\mathfrak{L}(\lambda)$.*

3.6. **Grand loop argument.** To prove theorems 3.26, 3.40 and 3.46, one has to generalize Kashiwara's grand-loop argument to our framework (see [Kas91]).

Instead of giving the whole grand-loop argument, we give a few lemmas that yield its generalization.

Notations 3.47. When working with a $\mathcal{A}$-lattice $\mathcal{L}$, we will write $m \equiv m'$ instead of $m = m' + v^{-1}\mathcal{L}$ for any $m, m' \in \mathcal{L}$.

The following result is about the tensor product:

Lemma 3.48. *Consider two dominant weights λ and λ', and $(m, m') \in \mathcal{L}(\lambda) \times \mathcal{L}(\lambda')_{\mu'}$. Then, for every imaginary vertex i and $l > 0$, we have:*

$$b_{i,l}(m \otimes m') \equiv \begin{cases} m \otimes b_{i,l}m' & \textit{if } \mathrm{wt}_i(m') > 0 \\ b_{i,l}m \otimes m' & \textit{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Remark 3.49. Note that since $\epsilon_i(m) \neq -\infty$ in this situation, this is exactly 3.23 (7).

Proof. We have already seen that when $i \in I^{\mathrm{im}}$, since $\mu' - \lambda' \in -\mathbb{N}I$, we have:

$$(i, \mu') = (i, \lambda') + (i, \mu' - \lambda') \geq 0.$$

We have also already seen that thanks to 3.14 (2), if $(i, \mu') = 0$, then $a_\iota b_{i,l}m' = b_{i,l}a_\iota m'$ for every $\iota \in I_\infty$. Hence $b_{i,l}m' = 0$ since the module spanned by $b_{i,l}m'$ is a strict submodule of $V(\lambda')$. Hence:

$$\begin{aligned} b_{i,l}(m \otimes m') &= b_{i,l}m \otimes K_{-li}m' + m \otimes b_{i,l}m' \\ &= v^{-l(i,\mu')}b_{i,l}m \otimes m' + m \otimes b_{i,l}m' \\ &\equiv \begin{cases} m \otimes b_{i,l}m' & \text{if } \mathrm{wt}_i(m') > 0 \\ b_{i,l}m \otimes m' & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 3.50. *Consider $i \in I^{\mathrm{im}}$ and $l > 0$. We have $\tau_{i,l} \equiv 1/l$ if $i \in I^{\mathrm{iso}}$, $\tau_{i,l} \equiv 1$ otherwise.*

Proof. First note that for any $i \in I^{\mathrm{im}}$ and $l > 0$, $\{E_{i,l}, E_{i,l}\} \equiv 1$ is required by 3.9. Assume moreover that:

$$\{E_{i,l}, E_{i,l}\} = \prod_{1 \leq k \leq l} \frac{1}{1 - v^{-k}},$$

which is consistent with [Boz13, 2.29]. Then, when $i \in I^{\mathrm{iso}}$, we have an isomorphism from the ring of symmetric functions $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}[x_k, k \geq 1]$ to $\mathbb{Z}[E_{i,l}, l \geq 1]$ mapping the elementary symmetric functions e_l to $v^{-l/2}E_{i,l}$ and such that the push-forward of $\{-,-\}$ is the Hall-Littlewood scalar product (still denoted by $\{-,-\}$). Asking for $a_{i,l}$ to be primitive and to satisfy $E_{i,l} - a_{i,l} \in \mathbb{Q}(v)[E_{i,k}, k < l]$ means

that the power sum symmetric functions p_l are mapped to $v^{-l/2}(-1)^{l-1}la_{i,l}$. Since the Hall-Littlewood scalar product satisfy $\{p_l, p_l\} = \frac{lv^{-l}}{1-v^{-l}}$, we get:

$$\tau_{i,l} = \{a_{i,l}, a_{i,l}\} = \frac{v^l}{l^2}\frac{lv^{-l}}{1-v^{-l}} = \frac{1/l}{1-v^{-l}} \equiv 1/l$$

as expected.

If $i \notin I^{\text{iso}}$, let us prove that $a_{i,l} \equiv E_{i,l}$ by induction on l. Write:

$$a_{i,l} - E_{i,l} = \sum_{\mathsf{c}\in\mathcal{C}_{i,l}\setminus\{(l)\}} \alpha_{\mathsf{c}} a_{i,\mathsf{c}}$$

for some $\alpha_{\mathsf{c}} \in \mathbb{Q}(v)$. By 3.11, for every $\mathsf{c}' \in \mathcal{C}_{i,l}\setminus\{(l)\}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\mathsf{c}\in\mathcal{C}_{i,l}\setminus\{(l)\}} \alpha_{\mathsf{c}}\{a_{i,\mathsf{c}}, a_{i,\mathsf{c}'}\} &= -\{E_{i,l}, a_{i,\mathsf{c}'}\} \\
&= -\{\delta(E_{i,l}), a_{i,\mathsf{c}'_1} \otimes a_{i,\mathsf{c}'\setminus\mathsf{c}'_1}\} \\
&= -v_i^{\mathsf{c}'_1|\mathsf{c}'\setminus\mathsf{c}'_1|}\{E_{i,\mathsf{c}'_1}, a_{i,\mathsf{c}'_1}\}\{E_{i,|\mathsf{c}'\setminus\mathsf{c}'_1|}, a_{i,\mathsf{c}'\setminus\mathsf{c}'_1}\} \\
&= -v_i^{\sum \mathsf{c}'_k\mathsf{c}'_{k+1}} \prod\{E_{i,\mathsf{c}'_k}, a_{i,\mathsf{c}'_k}\} \\
&= -v_i^{\sum \mathsf{c}'_k\mathsf{c}'_{k+1}} \prod \tau_{i,\mathsf{c}'_k} \\
&\equiv 0
\end{aligned}$$

by the induction hypothesis, and since $(i,i) < 0$. We have also used that $\tau_{i,k} = \{E_{i,k}, a_{i,k}\}$ since $\{a_{i,k}, a_{i,k} - E_{i,k}\} = 0$. Also, note that:

$$\det(\{a_{i,\mathsf{c}}, a_{i,\mathsf{c}'}\})_{\mathsf{c},\mathsf{c}'\in\mathcal{C}_{i,l}\setminus\{(l)\}} \equiv 1$$

since:

$$\begin{aligned}
\{a_{i,\mathsf{c}}, a_{i,\mathsf{c}'}\} &= \{a_{i,\mathsf{c}_1} \otimes a_{i,\mathsf{c}\setminus\mathsf{c}_1}, \prod(a_{i,\mathsf{c}'_k} \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes a_{i,\mathsf{c}'_k})\} \\
&= \sum_{k:\mathsf{c}'_k=\mathsf{c}_1} v_i^{\mathsf{c}'_{k-1}\mathsf{c}'_k} \tau_{i,\mathsf{c}_1}\{a_{i,\mathsf{c}\setminus\mathsf{c}_1}, a_{i,\mathsf{c}'\setminus\mathsf{c}'_k}\} \\
&\equiv \delta_{\mathsf{c}_1,\mathsf{c}'_1}\{a_{i,\mathsf{c}\setminus\mathsf{c}_1}, a_{i,\mathsf{c}'\setminus\mathsf{c}'_k}\} \\
&\equiv \cdots \equiv \delta_{\mathsf{c},\mathsf{c}'}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we get $\alpha_{\mathsf{c}} \equiv 0$, which implies $\tau_{i,l} = \{a_{i,l}, E_{i,l}\} \equiv \{E_{i,l}, E_{i,l}\} \equiv 1$. □

The following lemma deals with the behaviour of the generalized Kashiwara operators regarding our Hopf bilinear form $\{-,-\}$:

Lemma 3.51. *For any $u, v \in U^-$ and $(i,l) \in I_\infty$, $\{\tilde{f}_{i,l}u, v\} \equiv \{u, \tilde{e}_{i,l}v\}$.*

Proof. We can assume that $v = b_{i,\mathsf{c}}z$ for some $z \in \mathcal{K}_i$. If $i \in I^{\mathrm{im}}$ is not isotropic:

$$\begin{aligned}
\{\tilde{f}_{i,l}u, v\} &= \{b_{i,l}u, v\} \\
&= \{b_{i,l} \otimes u, \delta(b_{i,\mathsf{c}}z)\} \\
&= \tau_{i,l}\{u, \delta^{i,l}(b_{i,\mathsf{c}}z)\} \\
&= \tau_{i,l}\{u, \delta^{i,l}(b_{i,\mathsf{c}})z\} \qquad [\textit{c.f.}\ 3.14\ (1)] \\
&\equiv \{u, \delta^{i,l}(b_{i,\mathsf{c}})z\} \qquad [\textit{c.f.}\ 3.50] \\
&= \sum_{k:\mathsf{c}_k=l} v_i^{l\mathsf{c}_{k-1}}\{u, b_{i,\mathsf{c}\setminus\mathsf{c}_k}z\} \qquad [\textit{c.f.}\ 3.14\ (3)] \\
&\equiv \{u, b_{i,\mathsf{c}\setminus\mathsf{c}_1}z\} \\
&= \{u, \tilde{e}_{i,l}v\}.
\end{aligned}$$

This computation also proves the case $i \in I^{\mathrm{re}}$, $l = 1$, which is already known. If i is isotropic, $v = b_{i,\nu}z$ and $u = b_{i,\nu'}z'$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\{\tilde{f}_{i,l}u, v\} &= \sqrt{\frac{l}{m_l(\nu')+1}}\{b_{i,l}u, v\} \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{l}{m_l(\nu')+1}}\{b_{i,l} \otimes u, \delta(b_{i,\nu}z)\} \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{l}{m_l(\nu')+1}}\tau_{i,l}\{u, \delta^{i,l}(b_{i,\nu}z)\} \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{l}{m_l(\nu')+1}}\tau_{i,l}\{u, \delta^{i,l}(b_{i,\nu})z\} \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{l}{m_l(\nu')+1}}\tau_{i,l}m_l(\nu)\{u, b_{i,\nu\setminus l}z\}.
\end{aligned}$$

We see by induction that $\{\tilde{f}_{i,l}u, v\} = \{u, \tilde{e}_{i,l}v\} = 0$ if $\nu \neq \nu' \cup l$. Otherwise, we get, thanks to 3.50:

$$\{\tilde{f}_{i,l}u, v\} \equiv \sqrt{\frac{m_l(\nu)}{l}}\{u, b_{i,\nu\setminus l}z\} = \{u, \tilde{e}_{i,l}v\}.$$

□

In order to get an analogous result regarding the lattices $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$, first note that there exists for each $\lambda \in P^+$ a unique symmetric bilinear form $(-,-)$ on $V(\lambda)$ satisfying:

$$\begin{aligned}
(K_iu, u') &= (u, K_iu') \\
(b_{i,l}u, u') &= -(u, K_{-li}a_{i,l}u') \text{ if } i \in I^{\mathrm{im}} \\
(b_iu, u') &= \frac{v}{v^{-1}-v}(u, K_{-i}a_iu') \text{ if } i \in I^{\mathrm{re}} \\
(v_\lambda, v_\lambda) &= 1
\end{aligned}$$

for every $u, u' \in V(\lambda)$ and $(i,l) \in I_\infty$. Then:

Lemma 3.52. *For every $u, v \in \mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ and $(i,l) \in I_\infty$, $(\tilde{f}_{i,l}u, v) \equiv (u, \tilde{e}_{i,l}v)$.*

Proof. Assume that $v = b_{i,\mathsf{c}}z$ for some nontrivial c and some $z \in \mathcal{K}_i \cap V(\lambda)_\mu$. Note that we have already seen that $(i,\mu) \geq 0$, and that $b_{i,l}z = 0$ if $(i,\mu) = 0$. Hence we assume $(i,\mu) > 0$, otherwise there is nothing to prove. If $\omega_i \geq 2$, we have:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(\tilde{f}_{i,l}u, v) &= (b_{i,l}u, v) \\
&= -(u, K_{-li}a_{i,l}v) \\
&= -(u, K_{-li}a_{i,l}b_{i,\mathsf{c}}z) \\
&= -\Big(u, K_{-li}\tau_{i,l}\sum_{k:\mathsf{c}_k=l}\big(v_i^{-2l|\mathsf{c}_{<k}|}K_{-li} - v_i^{2l|\mathsf{c}_{<k}|}K_{li}\big)b_{i,\mathsf{c}\setminus\mathsf{c}_k}z\Big) \\
&\qquad [\textit{c.f.}\text{ proof of 3.38}] \\
&\equiv -\Big(u, \sum_{k:\mathsf{c}_k=l}\big(v_i^{-2l|\mathsf{c}_{<k}|}K_{-2li} - v_i^{2l|\mathsf{c}_{<k}|}\big)b_{i,\mathsf{c}\setminus\mathsf{c}_k}z\Big) \\
&\qquad [\textit{c.f.}\ 3.50] \\
&= -\Big(u, \sum_{k:\mathsf{c}_k=l}\big(v_i^{-2l|\mathsf{c}_{<k}|}v^{-2l(i,\mu-|\mathsf{c}\setminus\mathsf{c}_k|i)} - v_i^{2l|\mathsf{c}_{<k}|}\big)b_{i,\mathsf{c}\setminus\mathsf{c}_k}z\Big) \\
&= -\Big(u, \sum_{k:\mathsf{c}_k=l}\big(v_i^{2l|\mathsf{c}_{<k}|+4l|\mathsf{c}_{>k}|}v^{-2l(i,\mu)} - v_i^{2l|\mathsf{c}_{<k}|}\big)b_{i,\mathsf{c}\setminus\mathsf{c}_k}z\Big) \\
&\equiv (u, b_{i,\mathsf{c}\setminus\mathsf{c}_1}z) \\
&= (u, \tilde{e}_{i,l}v).
\end{aligned}
$$

Thanks to the proof of 3.38 and 3.50, the same can be proved if $\omega_i = 1$. To that end, consider $v = b_{i,\nu}z$ and $u = b_{i,\nu'}z$ for some partitions ν, ν' and elements $z, z' \in \mathcal{K}_i$,

assuming again that $z \in V(\lambda)_\mu$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\tilde{f}_{i,l}u, v) &= \sqrt{\frac{l}{m_l(\nu')+1}}(b_{i,l}u, v) \\
&= -\sqrt{\frac{l}{m_l(\nu')+1}}(u, K_{-li}a_{i,l}v) \\
&= -\sqrt{\frac{l}{m_l(\nu')+1}}(u, K_{-li}a_{i,l}b_{i,\nu}z) \\
&= -\sqrt{\frac{l}{m_l(\nu')+1}}\Big(u, K_{-li}\tau_{i,l}m_l(\nu)(K_{-li}-K_{li})b_{i,\nu\setminus l}z\Big) \\
&\qquad [\textit{c.f.} \text{ proof of } 3.38] \\
&\equiv -\sqrt{\frac{l}{m_l(\nu')+1}}\Big(u, \frac{m_l(\nu)}{l}(K_{-2li}-1)b_{i,\nu\setminus l}z\Big) \\
&\qquad [\textit{c.f.}\ 3.50] \\
&= -\sqrt{\frac{l}{m_l(\nu')+1}}\Big(u, \frac{m_l(\nu)}{l}(v^{-2l(i,\mu)}-1)b_{i,\nu\setminus l}z\Big) \\
&\equiv \sqrt{\frac{l}{m_l(\nu')+1}}\frac{m_l(\nu)}{l}(u, b_{i,\nu\setminus l}z).
\end{aligned}$$

Iterating this computation, we see that $(\tilde{f}_{i,l}u, v) = (u, \tilde{e}_{i,l}v) = 0$ if $\nu' \cup l \neq \nu$. Otherwise, we get:

$$(\tilde{f}_{i,l}u, v) \equiv \sqrt{\frac{m_l(\nu)}{l}}(u, b_{i,\nu\setminus l}z) = (u, \tilde{e}_{i,l}v)$$

The case $i \in I^{\mathrm{re}}$ is already known, but we reproduce the proof adapted to our conventions. The following can be proved by induction:

$$[E_i, F_i^{(n)}] = \tau_i\big(v^{-n+1}K_{-i} - v^{n-1}K_i\big)F_i^{(n-1)}.$$

Then, note that if $u = f_i^m u_0$ and $u' = f_i^n u_0'$, where $u_0, u_0' \in \mathcal{K}_i$, it is easy to prove that:

$$(\tilde{f}_i u, u') = (F_i^{(m+1)}u_0, F_i^{(n)}u_0') = 0$$

if $m+1 \neq n$. If $n = m+1$ and $u' \in V(\lambda)_\mu$, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\tilde{f}_i u, u') &= \frac{1}{[m+1]}\big(F_i u, F_i^{(n)} u'_0\big) \\
&= \frac{1}{[n]}\Big(u, \frac{v}{v^{-1}-v} K_{-i} E_i F_i^{(n)} u'_0\Big) \\
&= \frac{1}{[n]}\Big(u, \frac{v}{v^{-1}-v} K_{-i}\tau_i\big(v^{-n+1}K_{-i} - v^{n-1}K_i\big) F_i^{(n-1)} u'_0\Big) \\
&\equiv \frac{1}{[n]}\Big(u, \frac{v}{v^{-1}-v} K_{-i}\big(v^{-n+1}K_{-i} - v^{n-1}K_i\big) F_i^{(n-1)} u'_0\Big) \\
&= \frac{1}{[n]}\Big(u, \frac{v}{v^{-1}-v}\big(v^{-n+1}v^{-2(i,\mu+i)} - v^{n-1}\big) F_i^{(n-1)} u'_0\Big) \\
&= \Big(u, \frac{v^{-n+2}v^{-2(i,\mu+i)} - v^n}{v^{-n}-v^n} F_i^{(n-1)} u'_0\Big) \\
&= \Big(u, \frac{1 - v^{-2n+2}v^{-2(i,\mu+i)}}{1-v^{-n}} F_i^{(n-1)} u'_0\Big) \\
&\equiv \big(u, F_i^{(n-1)} u'_0\big) \\
&= \big(u, \tilde{e}_i u'\big).
\end{aligned}$$

We have assumed $(i, \mu+i) > 0$, since otherwise we would have $u' = 0$. □

The previous lemmas make it possible to reproduce step by step the original Kashiwara's grand loop argument (see [Kas91, §4]).

We also want to prove 3.46, using the same kind of argument as in [Nak01, 4.7]. To that end, the characterization of the crystals $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ given by Joseph in [Jos95, 6.4.21] has to be generalized. We first need two definitions:

Definition 3.53. A crystal $\mathcal{B}$ is said to be of *highest weight* λ if:

(1) there exists $b_\lambda \in \mathcal{B}$ with weight λ such that $\tilde{e}_\iota b_\lambda = 0$ for every $\iota \in I_\infty$;
(2) any element of $\mathcal{B}$ can be written $\tilde{f}_{\iota_1} \dots \tilde{f}_{\iota_r} b_\lambda$ for some $\iota_k \in I_\infty$.

Definition 3.54. Consider a family $\{\mathcal{B}_\lambda \mid \lambda \in P^+\}$ of highest weight normal crystals $\mathcal{B}_\lambda$ of highest weight λ, with elements $b_\lambda \in \mathcal{B}_\lambda$ satisfying the properties of the above definition. It is called *closed* if the subcrystal of $\mathcal{B}_\lambda \otimes \mathcal{B}_\mu$ generated by $b_\lambda \otimes b_\mu$ (*i.e.* obtained after successive applications of the $\tilde{e}_\iota$ and $\tilde{f}_\iota$) is isomorphic to $\mathcal{B}_{\lambda+\mu}$.

Our previous lemmas, along with the definitions and properties given in the previous sections make it possible to generalize the proof of [Jos95, 6.4.21] and get:

Proposition 3.55. *The only closed family of highest weight normal crystals is* $\{\mathcal{B}(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in P^+\}$.

Then it is easy to see that $\{\operatorname{Irr} \mathcal{L}(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in P^+\}$ is a closed family of highest weight normal crystals: thanks to 2.25, 2.6 adapted to $\widetilde{\mathfrak{Z}}$ and 2.30, the arguments given in [Nak01] can be reproduced and we get 3.46. Alternatively (but similarly), the original proof given by Saito in [Sai02] can also be generalized to our framework.

REFERENCES

[Boz13] Tristan Bozec. Quivers with loops and perverse sheaves. arXiv:1401.5302, 2013.

[HLRV13] Tamás Hausel, Emmanuel Letellier, and Fernando Rodriguez-Villegas. Arithmetic harmonic analysis on character and quiver varieties II. *Adv. Math.*, 234:85–128, 2013.

[HRV08] Tamás Hausel and Fernando Rodriguez-Villegas. Mixed Hodge polynomials of character varieties. *Invent. Math.*, 174(3):555–624, 2008. With an appendix by Nicholas M. Katz.

[JKK05] Kyeonghoon Jeong, Seok-Jin Kang, and Masaki Kashiwara. Crystal bases for quantum generalized Kac-Moody algebras. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 90(2):395–438, 2005.

[Jos95] Anthony Joseph. *Quantum groups and their primitive ideals*, volume 29 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995.

[Kas91] M. Kashiwara. On crystal bases of the Q-analogue of universal enveloping algebras. *Duke Math. J.*, 63(2):465–516, 1991.

[KKS09] Seok-Jin Kang, Masaki Kashiwara, and Olivier Schiffmann. Geometric construction of crystal bases for quantum generalized Kac-Moody algebras. *Adv. Math.*, 222(3):996–1015, 2009.

[KS94] Masaki Kashiwara and Pierre Schapira. *Sheaves on manifolds*, volume 292 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994. With a chapter in French by Christian Houzel, Corrected reprint of the 1990 original.

[KS97] Masaki Kashiwara and Yoshihisa Saito. Geometric construction of crystal bases. *Duke Math. J.*, 89(1):9–36, 1997.

[Li] Yiqiang Li. Canonical bases of Cartan-Borcherds type, II. Preprint.

[Lus91] G. Lusztig. Quivers, perverse sheaves, and quantized enveloping algebras. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 4(2):365–421, 1991.

[Lus00] G. Lusztig. Semicanonical bases arising from enveloping algebras. *Adv. Math.*, 151(2):129–139, 2000.

[MO12] Davesh Maulik and Andrei Okounkov. Quantum groups and quantum cohomology. arXiv:1211.1287, 2012.

[Nak94] H. Nakajima. Instantons on ALE spaces, quiver varieties, and Kac-Moody algebras. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 76(2):365–416, 1994.

[Nak98] Hiraku Nakajima. Quiver varieties and Kac-Moody algebras. *Duke Math. J.*, 91(3):515–560, 1998.

[Nak01] Hiraku Nakajima. Quiver varieties and tensor products. *Invent. Math.*, 146(2):399–449, 2001.

[Nak09] Hiraku Nakajima. Quiver varieties and branching. *SIGMA Symmetry Integrability Geom. Methods Appl.*, 5:Paper 003, 37, 2009.

[Sai02] Yoshihisa Saito. Crystal bases and quiver varieties. *Math. Ann.*, 324(4):675–688, 2002.

Department of Mathematics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, MA 02139, USA

e-mail: tbozec@mit.edu